

THE  
DUBLIN REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1880.

---

ART. I.—THE BIRTHPLACE OF ST. PATRICK,  
APOSTLE OF IRELAND.

1. *Fac-similes of National Manuscripts of Ireland*, selected and edited under the direction of the Master of the Rolls in Ireland. By J. T. GILBERT, F.S.A., &c., Public Record Office of Ireland, Dublin. Part I. 1874. Part II. 1878. Part III. 1879.
2. *An Inquiry as to the Birthplace of St. Patrick*. By T. H. TURNER, M.A., a Paper read for the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, and published in "Archæologia Scotica." Vol. V. Part I. Edinburgh. 1874.
3. *Three Middle-Irish Homilies*, on the Lives of SS. Patrick, Brigit, and Columba. Edited by WHITLEY STOKES. Calcutta. 1877.
4. *Loca Patriciana*. By the Rev. JOHN FRANCIS SHEARMAN. Dublin. 1879.
5. *The Life of St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*. By M. F. CUSACK. Dublin. 1870.
6. *The Life of St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland*. By Rev. W. B. MORRIS, Priest of the Oratory. Second Edition. London. 1879.

IT is only a little more than half a century since the opinion was first broached that Boulogne-sur-Mer, in the north of France, was the birth-place of our national Apostle St. Patrick ; and yet so great was the learning and ability of the Rev. Dr. Lanigan, who propounded this opinion, and so highly esteemed were his labours in the revival of the study of the Ecclesiastical History of our country, that it at once took a firm hold of the

popular mind, and has ever since been generally adopted by the popular writers of our history. Far different, however, was the opinion generally held for the past by those who had devoted their lives to illustrate the antiquities and the literature of Ireland. Colgan, in the seventeenth century, the golden age of Celtic studies, pointed to North Britain as the country hallowed by our Apostle's birth; and he declared this to be the common opinion of all who hitherto had written on the subject.\* A century later the illustrious Innes was able to assert that "the learnedest of the Irish and other foreign writers" were agreed in assigning Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, as the precise place where St. Patrick was born,† and Petrie and O'Donovan and O'Curry, the great masters of Irish literature in our own days, have adopted the same opinion.

The question is one of fact, and like other historical questions must be decided by the weight of the evidence that is produced in its favour. It is one, however, in which the spiritual children of St. Patrick take the deepest interest. Few nations have cherished for the first Fathers of their faith such love and reverence and honour as the Celtic race at home and abroad has ever shown to its great Apostle. The persistent efforts which, during the past years, have been made by Protestant writers to misrepresent his teaching, have only served to enliven more and more the ardour of the affection of his devoted sons, and perhaps there never was a time when his name was so honoured and each memorial of his blessed life so cherished, as at the present day.

To proceed with some order in our inquiry, I propose first to cite, with as much brevity as the matter will permit, the various passages of our writers, down to the close of the twelfth century, that bear upon this subject. I will then endeavour to recapitulate under a few heads the evidence which these witnesses of the tradition of Ireland shall have presented to us; and in conclusion I will add some remarks on the principal modern theories regarding the birthplace of our Apostle.

## I.

### *Testimonies of ancient writers.*

A.—I will commence with the testimony of St. Patrick himself. His "Confessio" or "Declaration of the Mercies of God,"

\* Colgan, "Verior et communis nostrorum domesticorum, et exterorum Scriptorum sententia est, S. Patricium in Majori Britannia natum esse." Trias, p. 221.

† Innes, "Civil and Eccles. Hist. of Scotland," edited by the Spalding Club, p. 34.



which all our writers now admit to be his genuine work,\* thus begins: "I Patrick, a sinner, the most unlearned and the least of all the faithful, and held in contempt by very many, had Calphurnius, a Deacon, for my father, the son of the late Potitus, a presbyter, who lived in the village of Bannavem Taberniæ. He had, close by, a small villa where I was made a captive (*qui fuit vico Bannavem Taberniæ, villulam enim prope habuit, &c.*)."<sup>✓</sup> I have followed in this passage the text of the Book of Armagh, which is more than a thousand years old and professes to be copied from the original written by St. Patrick's own hand. The MSS. in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum have "Banavem Taberniæ." The Bollandists read "Bonaven." The text published by Ware adds "*villulam Enon prope habuit,*" which, if correct, would give us the name of the villa from which St. Patrick was led into slavery.<sup>✓</sup>

In the tenth chapter of the "Confessio" we read: "After a few years, I was again in Britain with my kindred (*in Britannii eram cum parentibus meis*) who received me as a son, and earnestly besought me that then, at least, after the many tribulations I had endured, I should not go away from them any more." Again, in the nineteenth chapter: "Wherefore though I should have wished to leave (Ireland) that I might go unto Britain (*in Britannias*), a journey most desirable to me as unto my country and kindred (*quasi ad patriam et parentes*), and not thither only, but that I might go as far as Gaul (*usque Gallias*) to visit my brethren and to see the face of the Saints of the Lord."

In his letter to Coroticus, a British chieftain who had led away some of his converts into captivity, our Saint writes: "Among barbarians I dwell a stranger and an exile. . . . for them I have given up my country, and my kindred, and even life itself unto death if I be found worthy. . . . I have written and composed this letter to be sent and delivered to the soldiers to be forwarded to Coroticus, I do not say to my fellow-citizens (*non dico civibus meis*), nor to the fellow-citizens of the Roman Saints, but to the fellow-citizens of demons through their evil deeds. . . . companions of the Scots† and apostate Picts: . . . who is it that compelled me, constrained by the

\* The whole of the text of the "Confessio" as found in the Book of Armagh, and in the Bodleian MS. (Fell. 1, fol. 7, *seq.*) is given by Gilbert in "Nat. Manuscripts of Ireland," part 2nd. The text printed by the Bollandists from a MS. formerly preserved at the Abbey of St. Vaast, at Arras (*ad diem 17, Mart.*), is considered to be the most accurate and complete now extant.

† This was a pagan colony of Irish Scoti, who settled in Argyleshire in the third century. The Christian colony of Scoti did not proceed thither till the end of the fifth century.

Spirit, to give up all intercourse with my kindred? . . . . I was of noble birth, according to the flesh, my father being a Decurio; but for the benefit of others I bartered my nobility. I do not blush on that account, neither do I regret it. I am now given over to a foreign people for the ineffable glory of unceasing life which is in Christ Jesus our Lord, although my own people ignore me (*etsi mei non cognoscunt*)."

B.—I shall assign the next place to St. Fiacc's Irish poem in honour of our Apostle.\* St. Fiacc was a disciple of St. Patrick, and his demise cannot be placed later than the year 540. His poem is preserved in the "*Liber Hymnorum*," or ancient collection of "*Hymns of the Early Irish Church*," which probably was compiled by Adamnan towards the close of the seventh century, and of which two MSS. copies of the tenth century have been preserved. In both these MSS. the poem is complete, and in both a preface is prefixed which assigns it to St. Fiacc, "*Bishop of Sletty, and disciple of St. Patrick*." A fragment of the poem is given in the "*Leabhar Breac*" (fol. 99, b. 1.) which Petrie styles "*the oldest and best Irish MS. relating to Church history now preserved, or which perhaps the Irish ever possessed*;"† and here too St. Fiacc is named as its author. Portions of the poem are also met with in the other ancient Celtic MSS. in the British Museum, and elsewhere, as Mr. Curry informs us, and all concur in assigning the authorship of the poem to St. Fiacc. Now, this venerable authority attests that St. Patrick was born in Nemthur:—

"Patrick was born in Nemthur: it is this that has been declared in histories;

A child of sixteen years when he was brought under tears:

Succat his name, it was said; who was his father is to be known:

Son of Calpurn, son of Potitus, grandson of Deacon Odise."‡

C.—In the MSS. of the "*Liber Hymnorum*," just now referred to, the following important Irish gloss is added on the name Nemthur in the first strophe of St. Fiacc's Hymn, "*·i· cathir sein feil imbretnaib tuaiscirt ·i· Ailcluade*," thus translated by Colgan, Gilbert, and Stokes: "*Nemthur is a city in North Britain, viz., Ailcluade*." The authority of these glosses is very great. The two MSS. of the Book of Hymns, although dating from the tenth century, were copied from independent sources, as is manifest from the different hymns which they contain and the

\* The original text and translation have been published in the "*Irish Eccles. Record*," vol. iv. p. 269, and more recently by Gilbert in "*National Manuscripts of Ireland*," part i.; and by Stokes "*Goidelica*," 1872.

† Petrie, "*On the History, &c., of Tara*," p. 74.

‡ I have adopted the literal translation of Stokes, "*Goidelica*," p. 130.

different texts which they present. Nevertheless, several of the glosses like that which we have cited are the same in both manuscripts, and are adjudged by the best Celtic scholars to belong to a very early age, dating probably from the first compilation of the hymns in the seventh century.

In the St. Isidore's MS. of the "*Liber Hymnorum*" another gloss is added on a subsequent strophe, of which the following translation is given by Dr. Todd: "This was the cause of the servitude of Patrick; his father was Calpuirnn; Conches, daughter of Ochmuis, was his mother, and the mother of his five sisters, namely, Lupait, and Tigris, and Liamain, and Darerca, and the name of the fifth was Cinnenum. His brother was Sannan. They all went from the Britons of Alcluaid, across the Iccian Sea, southwards on a journey to the Britons who are on the Sea of Icht, namely, the Britons of Letha, because they had brethren (*i.e.*, relatives) there at that time. Now the mother of these children, namely, Conches, was of the Franks, and she was a near relative to Martin. At that time came seven sons of Sectmaide, King of Britain, in ships from the Britons, and they made great plunder on the Britons, viz., the Britons of Armoric Letha, where Patrick with his family was, and they wounded Calpuirnn there, and carried off Patrick and Lupait with them to Ireland.\*" This gloss is not found in the Trinity College MS., and can be accepted only as dating from the tenth century.

The value of these glosses was but little known in the time of Dr. Lanigan, and hence he dismisses them with but scanty courtesy. Two instances he adduces in proof of their being of no authority. In the first place, he says the word "Letha" receives two contradictory explanations, being at one time referred to Armoric Gaul, whilst at another it is used to designate Latium or Italy. To this I reply that modern research has proved the explanations given by the glosses to be quite correct. The name Letha was, by our early writers, applied equally to Italy and to Armoric Gaul,† and the error lies with Dr. Lanigan, and not with the author of the old Irish glosses. The second example which he gives is that the phrase "*Dar modhebroth*" is explained to mean "God is able to do this if he chooses;" whilst immediately after it is explained by "*Be God my Judge.*" Here again the error is to be imputed, not to the Irish gloss, but to Dr. Lanigan. The phrase, "*Dar modhebroth*," is a form of solemn asseveration frequently made use of by St. Patrick, as may be seen in the Tripartite Life, and in the other ancient records of

\* Todd's translation, "*St. Patrick*," p. 360.

† Curry, "*Lectures*," p. 502; Todd, "*Irish Neunius*," p. 69. Italy was called Southern Letha.

our Apostle's life; and in using it he appeals to the unerring judgment of God in proof of what he declares to be true. In the gloss the phrase is at first left untranslated, being permitted to the words, "God is able to do this if he chooses," which Dr. Lanigan mistook for a translation of the phrase, "Dar modhebroth;" but having given the full words of the Apostle, the gloss again returns to this phrase, and then assigns its correct meaning, precisely as given in Cormac's glossary,\* the *Leabhar Breac*; and other ancient authorities.

D.—The "*Vita Secunda*," thus styled in Colgan's series of "*Ancient Lives of St. Patrick*," records that our Apostle "was born in the town called Nemthor." It adds, "Patrick was born in the plain of Tabern, that is the '*Campus Tabernaculorum*,' which derived its name from the tents which at a certain time the Romans had erected there during the cold of winter."† This document is highly prized by the Bollandists and Colgan, who assign to it a very early date. Dr. Todd, judging from the details of its narrative, considers that the writer had the Book of Armagh before him, but does not assign to it an earlier date than about the year 900.‡

E.—The "*Vita Tertia*" repeats verbatim the words of the document (D) just cited. It gives Nemthor as the name of the town where St. Patrick was born, and it designates the district as "*Campus Tabuerni, id est campus Tabernaculorum*." It adds, however, in chapter 12, "Patrick, therefore, who was also called Suchet, was of the race of the Britons, and his country and place of birth were not far from the sea. His father, Calburnius, was the son of the venerable man Potitus."

F.—The "*Vita Quarta*," which is proved by intrinsic data to have been written before the year 774,§ and is assigned by some of our writers to St. Eleran, enters somewhat more into detail regarding the subject of which we treat. "Some affirm," it states, "that St. Patrick was of Jewish descent. For, when our Lord had offered up His life for the salvation of man, the Roman army, avenging His death, devastated Judea, and the Jews who were led into captivity were scattered over the whole world. Some of these settled among the Armoric Britons, of whom St. Patrick is said to have been born. And this would seem to be set forth in the Book of Epistles, which he wrote, when he says, 'We have been scattered unto the extremities of the earth for our sins, for we did not keep the law of God nor observe His commandments.' But it is more true and correct

\* Stokes, "*Cormac's Glossary*," p. 106; where he cites also the passages from the "*Leabhar Breac*," &c.

† Colgan, "*Trias*," p. 11.

‡ Todd, "*St. Patrick*," p. 293.

§ Todd, p. 298.

that he here speaks of that dispersion which the Britons suffered at the hands of the Romans, when some of them settled in the territory known as *Armorica*, near the *Tyrrhene Sea*. In that dispersion, therefore, his parents proceeded to the district of *Strathclyde*, in which territory Patrick was conceived and born, his father being *Calphurnius*, and his mother *Conchessa*, as he himself attests in his *Book of Epistles*, &c. *St. Patrick*, therefore, was born in the town of *Nemthor*, which name may be interpreted '*turris coelestis*,' and this town is situated in the plain of *Taburnia*, which was called '*campus Tabernaculorum*,' because the Roman army at a certain time fixed their tents there. But in the British tongue it is called the plain of *Tabern*. He is said, moreover, to have been born on a stone which is there held in honour. . . . The inhabitants of the place erected a church over the fountain in which he was baptized, and those acquainted with the place say that the fountain which is beside the altar is in the form of a cross."\*

G.—The Life of *St. Patrick* by *Probus* is the next document to which I will refer. This writer belongs to the ninth century, and as his narrative closely follows the very ancient fragments preserved in the *Book of Armagh*, his authority has been justly reckoned of the greatest weight. He thus begins his narrative: "*St. Patrick*, who was also called *Sochet*, was a Briton by birth, and having suffered many things in his youth, he became unto all his people and country a source of salvation. He was born in Britain (in *Britanniis natus est*), his father being *Calpurnius*, a deacon, the son of *Potitus*, a priest; and his mother was called *Concessa*. They were from the village *Bannave*, in the *Tiburnian* district, not far from the *Western Sea*, which village we have ascertained beyond doubt to be situated in the *Nentrian* territory, in which the giants are said to have dwelt in olden times (*quem vicum indubitanter comperimus esse Nentriae provinciae, in qua olim gigantes habitasse dicuntur*)."<sup>†</sup> A little later he thus writes: "Whilst *Patrick* was as yet in his own country with his father, *Calpurnius*, and his mother, and with his brother, *Ructhi*, and his sister called *Mila*, in their city *Arimuric*, there was great disturbance there; for the sons of *King Rethmit* from Britain laid waste *Arimuric* and the other neighbouring places, and murdered *Calpurnius* with his wife *Concessa*, and having led off captives their sons *Patrick* and *Ructhi* with their sister, landed in Ireland."<sup>†</sup>

H.—The Irish "*Tripartite Life*" as it has come down to us must be assigned to the tenth century, although many parts of it belong undoubtedly to a much earlier time. Its statement

\* Colgan, "*Trias*," p. 35.

† Colgan, pp. 47, 48.

relating to St. Patrick's birthplace in Mr. Hennessy's valuable translation, is as follows: "Patrick was of the Britons of Alcluaid by origin. Calpurnn was his father's name; he was a noble priest. Potid was his grandfather's name, whose title was a deacon. Conceis was his mother's name; she was of the Franks, and a sister to Martin. In Nemthur,\* moreover, the man St. Patrick was born." It subsequently states that St. Patrick was reared in Nemthur (nutritus est in Nemthur), and it adds, whilst narrating some facts of his infancy, that: "one time the King of Britain's steward went to command Patrick and his nurse to go and clean the hearth of the Royal house in Al-Cluaid."†

I.—It is only a few years since the genuine text of our ancient chronicler, Maelbrigte (better known under the name of Marianus Scotus), was published by Pertz in the "*Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*."‡ Marianus was born in the year 1028, and was educated in the monastery of Moville in the County Down. He died at Mayence, in Germany, in 1082. The autograph of his Chronicle is preserved in the Vatican Library, and from it I have taken the following entries, which, however, are accurately given by Pertz. Under the year 372 Marianus registers the birth of St. Patrick in the island of Britain: "*Sanctus Patricius nascitur in Britannia insula, ex patre nomine Calpuirn*," &c. Again, under the years 388 and 431 our Saint is styled, "*Sanctus Patricius, genere Brittus*."

K.—In the "*Leabhar Breac*" there is a homily or sketch of our Saint's life composed before the twelfth century, which has recently been published with a translation by the eminent Irish scholar, Mr. Whitley Stokes.§ The following is the account it gives of St. Patrick's place of birth: "Patrick's race was of the Britons of Ailcluaide. Calpurn was his father's name, a high priest was he. Otid was the name of his grandfather; he was a deacon. But Conchess was his mother's name; daughter was she of Ochbas; of France was her race, that is, she was a sister of Martin's. . . . At Nemthur now was he born, and as to the flag-stone on which he was born, when anyone commits perjury thereunder, it sheds water as if it were bewailing the false declaration. . . . The holy Patrick was reared at Nemthur during his childhood." Then follow the miracles which he performed in childhood. One of these is said to have been performed when "Patrick went with his foster-father to a

\* Colgan's text adds that Nemthur, according to the etymology of the name, means "*coelestis turris*."

† "*Life of St. Patrick*," by S. M. F. Cusack, pp. 373, 375.

‡ Pertz, "*Monumenta*," vol. vii. p. 540.

§ Stokes, "*Three Middle-Irish Homilies*," 1877, p. 3, *seq.*



meeting of the Britons." Another, like that of the Tripartite Life, refers to his foster-mother being ordered by the King's steward "to cleanse the hearth of the palace at Ailcluade;" it became at once so clean through the prayers of Patrick that he exclaimed, "If all the firewood of Britain were burnt on the hearth, it need not be again cleansed till doom."

L.—The "Book of Lismore," another venerable repository of the early records of the Irish Church, has also a fragment of an ancient Celtic homily for the feast of our Apostle, in which we read: "Patrick's father was of the Britons of Alcluaid; Potaide Deacon was his grandfather; Conchess was his mother's name, daughter of Ochmas of the Franks, and she was sister of Martin; and in Nemthor he was born; and the flag upon which he was born, when a false oath is made upon it, sheds water as if it were lamenting the false oath; if, however, the oath be true, the flag remains unchanged," (MSS., R.I.A., fol. i. col. 6).

M. — O'Curry in the second series of his "Lectures" assigns, on the authority of the Four Masters, to Flann of Monasterboice, who died in the year 1056, the following short genealogical poem on our own Apostle:—

Son of Calphrann, son of Fotide,  
Son of Deisse, not liable to reproach;  
Son of great Cormac, son of Lebríuth,  
Son of Ota, son of Orric the good,  
Son of Moric, son of Leo, full of prosperity;  
Son of Maximus, why not name him?  
Son of Encretta, the tall and comely;  
Son of Philistis, the best of men;  
Son of Ferenus, of no mean repute;  
Son of Brittan, otter of the sea,  
From whom the passionate Britons descend;  
Nemthor was his native town.\*

N.—In the valuable MS. marked H, 3.18., in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, there is a short notice of St. Patrick corresponding in part with the "Leabhar Breac." It thus sets forth his place of birth: "The radiance, the blaze, and the bright gem, and the brilliant lamp that gave light to the Western World, *i.e.*, Sanctus Patricius. Patrick now was of the Britons; Alcluaid was his native place; Calpurn was his father's name, a noble priest; Fotid was his grandfather's name; Deochan his family name, *i.e.*, his surname."

There is another short but very ancient notice which Mr. O'Curry found in his researches among our old Irish MSS. As I have not the special reference, I may be permitted to insert it

---

\* O'Curry, "Lectures," 2nd series, lect. viii. p. 166.

here: "In a village, the name of which is Hurnia, in Britain, near the city of Empter, Patrick was born." ("Ir. Eccles. Record," iv. 283.)

O.—Jocelyn, towards the close of the twelfth century, composed from the then existing records a very full life of our Apostle. The first chapter thus begins: "There was a certain man, Calphurnius by name, the son of Potitus, a priest, a Briton by birth, dwelling in the village called Taburnia, situated in the Campus Tabernaculorum, so called from the tents which the Roman army had erected there, near the town Empthor,\* bordering on the Irish Sea (secus oppidum Empthor degens, mari Hibernico collimitans habitatione)." The circumstances of St. Patrick's birth are then detailed; and it is added that the well at which he was baptized was called St. Patrick's Well, "secus limbum maris, super quem posteriorum diligentia aedificavit oratorium habens altare in modum crucis extructum."† The place is further identified in the eleventh chapter, where it is said that there stood, on a certain promontory rising above the said town Empthor, a fortification, "of which some ruins still remain. . . . This place is famous, situated in the valley of the Clyde, and called in the language of that country Dunbreaton—i.e., the rock of the Britons. (In quodam promontorio supereminenti prae-fato oppido Empthor, munitio quaedam extructa, cujus adhuc murorum apparent ruinosa vestigia. . . . Est autem locus celebris in valle Clud situs, linguâ gentis illius Dunbreaton, id est, mons Britonum.)"

## II.

### *Evidence given by these authorities.*

1  
Having thus given in full all the references to the birthplace of St. Patrick which are preserved in the records of our country down to the close of the twelfth century, I will now recapitulate under distinct heads the special evidence which this long series of ancient authorities presents.

1. The first place shall be assigned to the clear testimony of our ancient chronicler Marianus Scotus, who attests that St. Patrick was born "in the island of Britain." Even if the testimony of Marianus were to stand alone it could not be easily set aside, for he had devoted his life to historical studies, and the various entries in his Chronicle which have reference to Ireland are all found to bear with them the impress of indisputable authority. well  
no

\* Colgan prints the name Nempthor, but adds in the notes that the MSS. have it Empthor.

† Colgan, "Acta," p. 65.



2. Several of the other ancient records call St. Patrick "a Briton," and state that he was born "in Britain." Our Apostle himself calls Britain his country, and uses the plural name *Britannias*\* to designate it. Moreover he distinguishes between his native Britain and Gaul, for which he again uses the plural name *Gallias*.† Now it would be difficult for St. Patrick writing in the fifth century to express in clearer terms that we are to look for his birth-place in the island of Britain. The portion of Britain which was subject to the Romans had been gradually formed into five distinct provinces, that is Britannia Prima and Britannia Secunda, and three other provinces distinguished by the addition of imperial names. Hence the plural form of the name was at this time commonly applied to the island of Britain. It may be true indeed, as Dr. Lanigan contends, that the first inhabitants of Britain came to their home in the British Isles from the north of Gaul or Belgium; but it still remains true that it was only at a comparatively late period that the name *Britannia* began to be applied to any part of the Continent. The learned Benedictine Lobineau affirms that it was only after the middle of the fifth century that this name began to be used to designate a portion of the Gaulish territory. "About the year 458," he writes, "the inhabitants of the island of Britain, flying from the swords of the Saxons, gave to a portion of the territory of Armoric Gaul the name of Bretagne."‡ Even then, however, the plural form of the name continued to be restricted to the island of Britain; and there is no example of its being used in reference to Bretagne in France until the close of the sixth century.

As regards the plural form of the name *Gallias*, it must be borne in mind that the Gaulish territory was also divided by its Roman masters into several provinces, having the city of Treves for their capital, and comprising not only the present territory of France, but also the modern Belgium and some parts of Germany. The distinction which St. Patrick draws between *Gallias* and his native country excludes every portion of French territory from the claim of being his birth-place. We find precisely the same form of expression used by Catullus to designate the island of Britain and Gaul:—

Hunc Galliae timent, timent Britanniae.

\* "Book of Armagh" "in Britannis;" Bodleian MSS., "in Britannis." The Bollandists have in the first passage, "in Britannia," but in the second have "in Britannias."

† Jocelyn uses a somewhat similar phrase, when speaking of our Apostle proceeding to the school of St. Germanus; "Natale solum Britanniae pertransiens Galliarum fines adivit." (Colgan, "Trias," p. 66.)

‡ Lobineau, "Histoire de la Bretagne," vol. i. p. 5.

No one will hesitate to admit that it would be incorrect at the present day to use such a phrase; "I will proceed to Normandy and will even go as far as France;" and equally incorrect would be the form of expression used by our Apostle in the fifth century, in the hypothesis of those who contend that his native place must be sought for not in the island of Britain, but in some part of the territory of Gaul.

3. From the gloss in the "*Liber Hymnorum*" and from the testimony of the Tripartite Life, the "*Leabhar Breac*," the "*Book of Lismore*" and other records above cited, we learn that *Alclyde* was the birthplace of St. Patrick; and from the manner in which this name is used in these records it is manifest that it was supposed to be familiar to Irish readers from the seventh to the twelfth century, the period during which these writings were composed. Now there cannot be any doubt as to the place to which this name refers. The name itself indeed implies a high rock on the banks of the Clyde. Colgan explains it: "*Al-Cluid, id est, Rupis seu Petra Cluidæ*" ("*Trias*," p. 222), and elsewhere he writes: "In the ancient Gaelic or Irish language, *Ail* is equivalent to '*Saxum*' or '*Petra*;' and the fortress placed on the high rock near the river Clyde is called *Ailcluit*."\* So also Stokes, "*Ail-Cluaide, literally Rock of Cluad, now Clyde*;"† and O'Reilly in like manner explains *Aill* and *All* to mean "a high mountain, a great steep, a precipice, a rock or cliff."‡ We find, moreover, the same name often used elsewhere by mediæval writers, and their unvarying testimony refers it to the strong fort and city which some centuries ago was known as Dunbritton, but is called Dumbarton at the present day. No name indeed could be more appropriate to this precipitous rock of basalt which rises to the height of about three hundred feet on the north bank of the Clyde: "it rises sheer up, from the circumjacent low, flat, marshy tract, and it stands completely isolated from any other elevations."§ Towards the summit it forms a double peak, and is cleft by a narrow deep chasm. Venerable Bede more than once mentions it under the name of Alcluith. In the first chapter of his "*Ecclesiastical History*" he describes the Clyde "as a very large gulf of the sea, which in former times divided the Picts from the Britons, which gulf runs from the west far inland, where to this day stands the strong city of the Britons, called Alcluith."|| Again, in the twelfth chapter, he speaks of "the city Alcluith, which in the language of the Britons signifies the Rock of Cluith, for it is situated close by the river of that name:" he adds that the

\* Colgan, "*Acta, SS.*," p. 188. † Stokes, "*Three Homilies*," p. 4.

‡ O'Reilly, "*Irish Dictionary*," ad voc.

§ O'Hanlon, "*Lives*," &c., iii. p. 463.

|| Bede, "*H. E.*," i. 1.

famous wall or vallum which separated the Picts from the Britons commenced to the east at Penneltun and stretched across to the Clyde on the west near the city of Alcluith, "juxta urbem Ailcluith."\* It was also known to Adamnan, who Latinizes the name by "Petra-Cloithe," that is "the Rock of the Clyde."† Hoveden, in his Annals under the year 756, narrates how Egbert, King of Northumbria, and Unnust, King of the Picts, led their united armies to Alcluit and there compelled the Britons to submit: "Duxerunt exercitum ad urbem Alcluit, ibique Britones in deditionem receperunt prima die Augusti." A century later the siege and destruction of the fort of Alclyde by the Northern pirates are duly chronicled by the British and Irish annalists. Thus in "Brut y Tywysogion;" "eight hundred and seventy was the year of Christ, and Caer-Alclut was demolished by the Pagans:"‡ and in the "Annales Cambriæ:" "Arx Alt-Clut a gentilibus fracta est." The Annals of Ulster in the same year have "The Burning of Al-Cluade," whilst in the "Ogygia" the entry is given "Obsessio Aili-Cluith."§ In the "Four Ancient Books of Wales" this fortress is often mentioned under the name *Alclud* :—

There will come from Alclud, men, bold, faithful,  
To drive from Prydein bright armies.||

Camden in his "Britannia" speaking of Dumbarton says: "Hæc olim Alclud, sed postea a Britannis, qui eam longo tempore contra Scotos tenuerunt, Dunbritton id est Brittanorum oppidum dici coepit."¶ These extracts from British and Irish writers seem to me such as enable us to identify beyond all controversy the city of Alclyde in which St. Patrick was born.

4. In the poem of St. Fiace and most of the other ancient documents already cited, Nemthur or Nemthor is assigned as the birth-place of St. Patrick. The gloss of the "Liber Hymnorum," as we have just now seen, gives this as the name of "a city in North Britain, otherwise called Ailcluade." The Vita Quarta further states that Nemthor was situated "in the territory of Strathclyde." By the name of Strathclyde, the kingdom, half Celtic, half British, that sprung up in the Roman province of Valentia, with Alclyde for its capital, long continued to be known. It was only in the tenth century that this kingdom

\* Bede, H. E., i. 12.

† Adamnan, "Vita S. Columb.," i. 8.

‡ Ithel, "Brut of Tywysogion," or "The Chronicle of the Princes," edited for the Master of the Rolls, 1860, p. 15.

§ O'Flaherty, "Ogygia," p. 485.

|| Skene, "Four A. Books," i. 441. See other extracts in "Arthurian Localities," by Stuart Glennie, Edinburgh, 1869, p. 88.

¶ Camden, p. 666.

ceased to exist. In the year 946 the Annals record that "Strathclyde was ravaged by the Saxons," and in 973 its last King, Dunwallon, died a recluse in Rome.\* I may add that the "Leabhar Breac," the "Book of Lismore," and the "Tripartite Life" all serve to identify Nemthur with Alclyde.†

There has been considerable discussion from time to time as to the origin and etymology of this name, Nemthur. In several of the ancient texts which we have cited, it is explained to mean "coelestis turris," that is, a heavenly tower. Taking the Celtic name as it stands, and in its literal meaning, this explanation is quite accurate. We know from the old Irish glossaries that the Celtic *Nem* corresponds to the Cymric and British *Nen*, and to the Latin *coelestis*.‡ So, too, the Celtic *Thor* is often used as an equivalent of the Latin "Turris;" thus in O'Reilly's "Dictionary" we have *Tor* and *Tur* explained by "a tower, a castle, a spire, a steeple." Frequently, however, in proper names in Ireland as in Britain it refers to a high rock, or mountain peak, as in *Torinis*, now Tory Island, so called from its rocky peaks, and in *Tor St. Michael*, near Glastonbury, and the *Tors* of Devonshire, and the many *Tory* hills which are met with in various parts of Ireland. Dr. Lanigan, indeed, finds fault with the interpretation of the name given by the ancient writers, and affirms that, in order to mean "coelestis turris," the name should be written *Nerthur* in the aspirated form.¶ This statement, however, only serves to prove that our illustrious historian was but little skilled in the old Celtic language. It was at a much later period that the aspirate was introduced, but in the ancient forms of the language, the name should precisely be written *Nemthur* for the Irish Celts, and *Nenthor* for the Welsh and Britons.¶

\* See Skene, "Annals of the Scots and Picts;" and Shearman, "Loca Patriciana," Appendix 1st, p. 454.

† Rev. John O'Hanlon, "Lives," &c., iii. p. 419, refers to some of these texts as saying that Nemthur was "near Alcluaid." There is nothing, however, in any of the texts to justify this statement.

‡ Stokes, Cormac's "Glossary," p. 121; Turner, "The Cymric *Nen*, which was probably the word on which the name was formed, means a vault, and hence metaphorically heaven, the corresponding adjective being *Nenni*," p. 276. Hence the proper name Nennius and Ninias is often Latinized "Celestius."

§ Joyce, "Irish Names," p. 386; "in many parts of Ireland, as for instance in Donegal, it is applied to a tall rock resembling a tower, without any reference to an artificial structure." Of Tory Island he says, "the island abounds in lofty isolated rocks which are called *tors* or towers, and the name *torach* means simply towery, abounding in tower-like rocks." || Lanigan, i. 101.

¶ Todd. "Dr. Lanigan's criticism is untenable, and only proves his ignorance of the Celtic language. This sort of aspiration occurs in the modern Celtic only," p. 356.

Thus then the interpretation of the name given by our ancient writers corresponds to the literal meaning of the words which compose it, but, I must add, that this is no proof that such in reality was the origin of the name. Take for instance the name *Belfast*. Many of the inhabitants of that important town interpret the name as implying a "Bell set fast," and this interpretation is even introduced into the city arms. Now such indeed is the literal meaning of the words which compose the name, but no one at all acquainted with the Irish form of the name would admit that such was its true origin.\* It was precisely so with the ancient writers to whom we have referred; they took the name *Nemthur* as they found it, and assigned its literal meaning, leaving to others to enquire into its true origin.

Some Celtic scholars with O'Flaherty have derived the name from *Nemidh*, one of the great founders of the Tuatha-Danaan race, who dwelt in this territory, and they interpret it to mean "turris Nemathe," the stronghold of *Nemidh*.† Others have sought an explanation of the name by reference to some hero called *Nem*, or *Nen*, of whom several are met with in the early history of the Celtic race. Such derivations, however, are arbitrary, based on mere conjecture, and have no ancient authority to support them. ✓

More probable seems the opinion that it is a contracted form of *Nemeththor*, derived from *Thor* and *Nemeth*, that is "the chapel rock" for, in Cormac's "Glossary," *Nemeth* is explained to mean "a chapel, as if *Nem-iath*, or heaven-land."‡ Such contractions are not unfrequent. We have an instance at *Neuthorn*, in *Berwickshire*, which, as appears from old records, was formerly written *Naithans thirn*. It is in favour of this opinion that from time immemorial there was a chapel on *Dumbarton rock*, dedicated to *St. Patrick*. Close to the burgh of *Lanark* there is an ancient township called *Nemphlar*. Our Glossaries explain the Celtic *plae* and the Cymric *ffle* to mean an inclosure, a meadow, a level place, "quasi a platea," as Cormac's "Glossary" has it; and hence we may not err in interpreting this name to mean "the chapel inclosure." Some have been struck with the similarity of *Nemphlar* to *Nemthur*, and have been disposed to consider it nothing more than a corruption of the latter name. It seems to me, however, to have quite a distinct etymology, the more so as it is difficult to conceive what connection there could be between *Alclyde* and *Nemphlar*. what

The late Professor O'Curry, when examining the Celtic MSS. in the Bodleian Library and the British Museum, discovered

\* See Joyce, "Irish Names," p. 348. † "Ogygia," part i. p. 12.

‡ Stokes, "Cormac's Glossary," p. 121.

that in some very ancient Irish texts, the name was written *Emthur*, and it has since then been generally admitted that the initial *N* is merely euphonious, being derived from the preposition or the article prefixed. It would be easy to multiply instances of proper names in which the initial *N* has been introduced in like manner: it is thus in *Nenagh*, *Nurney*, *Newry*, the *Nore*, the *Naul*, and several other names with which every one is familiar.\* We have seen, in the extracts already given, that the name is written *Emphor* in the original Latin text of *Jocelyn*. I may add that the old *Parisian Breviary*, in its lessons, has, "in *Britannia natus, oppido Emphoria*;" and the *Armagh Breviary*, in like manner, "in *illo Britanniae oppido nomine Emptor*."

This discovery of O'Curry has led to two interpretations of the name, either of which may be considered as quite satisfactory. The first of these assumes that *Em* is the old Celtic superlative particle, and hence explains the name *Emthur* as equivalent to "the great rock," or "the great fort;" and it must be admitted that no name could be more appropriate for the precipitous rock on which the impregnable castle of *Dumbarton* stands. The other interpretation adopts *Entur* as the original form of the name, and from "*En, i.e., Unus*," explains it to mean "the solitary rock." The numeral *En* is not unfrequently thus introduced in the Celtic proper names, as *an Endrum*, corrupted to *Nendrum*; *an Entreb*, "*unica domus*," the ancient name of *Antrim*, &c. This explanation has also the merit of being an accurate description of the singular basaltic rock which stands alone, arising almost perpendicularly, on the north bank of the *Clyde*. Nor can we wonder that the original *Nenthur* was softened to *Nemthur*. We have an instance to illustrate such a change, in the modern name of the same place: it is now only known as *Dumbarton*, whilst a century ago it was invariably written *Dunbarton*.

A difficulty here presented itself to *Colgan*, and *Dr. Lanigan* has not failed to make use of it, whilst endeavouring to reject the opinion that *St. Patrick* was born in *North Britain*. If *Nemthur* was a name of the strong British fort on the banks of the *Clyde*, how happens it (asks *Colgan*) that no trace of such a name is to be met with in any of the ancient records of British history? *Colgan*, indeed, could answer that only very few monuments of British history have been preserved that refer to this early period, and then it is but natural that the Roman name *Theodosia* should be used in preference, or the Celtic *Alclud*, or the later British name *Dunbritton*. Some trace, moreover,

\* Reeves "*Eccles. Antiq.*," p. 116; *Joyce*, *passim*.



of the original name, Nemthur, may perhaps be recognized in the old Geographical Ravenna Treatise, which in its list of British towns gives us in one text the name, Nemeton and in another Memanturum,\* which may not improbably be set down as corruptions of the name Nemthur. It is only, however, since the publication of the Black Book of Caermarthen (the most ancient manuscript of Wales) that this difficulty has been set at rest for ever.† We find there a poem of Taleissin, in which the very name of which we are in search is introduced. Rederech, the hero of the poem, sets out from Wales to recover the kingdom of Strathelyde, from which some years before he had been expelled. With his fleet he sails to *Nevthur*,‡ and there, on the banks of the Clyde, fights the battle which restores to him his lost inheritance. This passage not only supplies us with the name of this strong British fort, for which Colgan and Lanigan had searched in vain, but it leads us, moreover, to look for it on the banks of the Clyde, where precisely we should expect to find it, in accordance with the narrative given in the "Lives of St. Patrick."

5. Several of the ancient texts affirm that St. Patrick's birthplace was situated in the "Plain of Tabern, or Taburn," which the Celts would call Magh-Tabern, and which is Latinized Campus Tabernæ. The particulars which are added all seem to identify this plain with the rich valley which is watered by the Clyde, and from the rock of Dumbarton stretches for miles inland towards the Frith of Forth. Through this valley ran the famous wall erected by the Romans against the Picts:—

The isthmus between the Forth and Clyde (writes Mr. Skene) presents towards the west the appearance of a great valley, having the Campsie and Kilsyth hills on the north, and on the south a series of lesser rising grounds extending in a continuous line from sea to sea; while the hills on the opposite side recede as the valley approaches towards the east, till the view from the southern rising ground extends over the magnificent plain of the Carse of Falkirk, with the upper part of Frith of Forth stretching along its northern limit. The Roman wall was constructed along the ridge of the southern rising grounds, and the remains of this stupendous work have at all times arrested the attention of even the careless observer. This great work, as it presents itself to the inspection of those who have examined it minutely, consisted of a large rampart of intermingled stone and earth, strengthened by sods of turf, and must have originally measured twenty

\* See Pinkerton's "Enquiry," &c., vol. i. p. 430.

† Skene, "The Four Ancient Books of Wales," 1868, vol. i.; and "Celtic Scotland," vol. ii., 1877, p. 436.

‡ It is to be remarked that the MS. has a modernized text, and hence presents the aspirated form of the name. Mr. Ferguson, however, asserts that the reading of the MS. is Nenthur. "Congal," 1872, p. 196.

feet in height and twenty-four feet in breadth at the base. It was surmounted by a parapet, having a level platform behind it, for the protection of its defenders. In front there extended along its whole course an immense fosse, averaging about forty feet wide and twenty feet deep. To the southward of the whole was a military way, presenting the usual appearance of a Roman causewayed road. This great barrier extended from Bridgeness, near Carriden, on the Frith of Forth, to Chapel Hill, near West Kilpatrick, on the Clyde, a distance of twenty-seven English miles, having, at intervals of about two miles, small square forts or stations, which, judging from those that remain, amounted in all to nineteen in number, and between them were smaller watch-towers.\*

Such being the valley of the Clyde, we may inquire whether its history harmonizes with the account of the "*Campus Tabernæ*," as given in our ancient records. The documents D and E inform us that the plain of Tabern was so called from the huts or tents which the Roman troops had erected there. The *Vita Quarta* states that this plain was known to the Britons as *Magh-Tabern*, but was called by the Romans "*Campus Tabernaculorum*," from the number of huts erected there by the Roman army. Jocelyn gives the same explanation of the name. Now, this is precisely what we would expect to find in the valley of the Clyde. More than once the Roman legions had encamped there to repel the incursions of the Picts. We find the Emperor Theodosius sending his troops thither in the year 369, that by occupying its castella or outposts the Northern marauders might be kept in check. Again, in the year 396, when the Britons applied to the Roman commander, Stilicho, for aid, "a legion was sent to Britain, which, for the time, drove back the invading tribes, and garrisoned the wall between the Forth and the Clyde."†

Dr. Todd, in his "*Memoir of St. Patrick*," takes to task our ancient writers for giving such an explanation of the name. "Some of the biographers say," he thus writes, "that the place had its name of *Tabernæ* or *Taberniæ* from the tabernacles or tents of an antient Roman camp which was formerly there. This cannot possibly be so; for *Tabernæ* signifies booths or shops, not tabernacles or tents."‡

Now, it is not our ancient writers who have fallen into error, but Dr. Todd has been himself betrayed into a most singular mistake. In later times, indeed, a distinction was drawn between the *tabernæ* and the *tabernacula*; but strictly speaking, as the learned Latinist Facciolati writes, "*Taberna*" indicates "*omne utile ad habitandum ædificium*;" and the same

\* Skene, "*Celtic Scotland*," vol. i. p. 77.

† Skene, *ibid.*, i. 105.

‡ Todd, p. 358.



writer adds the authority of Festus to prove that both words were originally the same: "*tabernacula dicuntur a similitudine tabernarum.*"\*

The ancient writers, however, seem to imply that the Roman name of *Campus Tabernaculorum* was only a secondary one, superadded to the older British or Celtic name of Tabern, or Magh-Tabern, by which the valley of the Clyde was designated. The Rev. Duncan Macnab, in his "*Archæological Dissertation on the Birth-place of St. Patrick,*" inquiring into the etymology of this old Celtic name, derives it from the words *tabh*, i.e., "the sea," and *Erin*, so that Magh-Tabern would mean "the plain of the Irish Sea." This would, perhaps, be a satisfactory explanation if the plain in question were bordering on the Irish Sea, but extending as it does inland towards the Frith of Forth, it is not so apparent how such a name could be given to it.

The learned author of the "*Ogygia,*" writing two hundred years ago, when the Celtic traditions were much more vivid and more clearly defined than at the present day, records—not as a conjecture but as a matter of history—that the valley of the Clyde was at an early period known as Magh-Taburn, from Taburnus, the ancestor of the Tuatha-Danaann. "In former times," he writes, "in the territory of Alclyde, at Dunbriton, in Scotland, there was the '*Campus Taburni*:' in its town, Nemthor, St. Patrick was born. Wherefore, by the writers of St. Patrick's Life, it is written '*Campus Tabernaculorum*,' as if it were so called from the tents of the Romans who pitched their camp there; but it is to be held that the name was derived rather from that Taburnus (or Tabarn), the ancestor of the Danaans, who from that district of Britain passed over to Ireland."†

6. Probus, who is one of the most accurate of the historians of our Apostle's life, gives us the "*vicus Bannave*" as the place where Calphurnius dwelt. Some, indeed, have cited his words as if he placed St. Patrick's birth in the village Bannave, but Probus makes no such statement. He very clearly asserts that the parents of our Apostle, Calphurnius and Concessa, were "*e vico Bannave*" "from the village Bannave in the Tiburnian district, not far from the Western Sea." It is manifest that this "*vicus Bannave*" of Probus is the same as the "*vicus Banaven*" of St. Patrick's "*Confessio*," which is sometimes written Bonaven; for in our early Celtic pronunciation the *a* and the *o* are constantly interchanged.

Can we find any trace of such a name in the valley of the Clyde, whither all the past indications of which we have spoken have almost unconsciously led us to look for the scenes of St.

\* Forcellini, "*Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*," ad voc.

† "*Ogygia*," part 3, cap. 13, p. 178.

Patrick's childhood? I unhesitatingly say, Yes. The name itself, indeed, implies nothing more than "the river's mouth;" as *Bun*, *Bon*, and *Ban* are constantly used to indicate the mouth or efflux of a stream, and *Avon* or *Awe* is the common name for a river or stream, in all the Celtic dialects. Thus we have the *Avon-ree*, *Avon-mor*, *Avon-beg*, and a thousand similar names. The well-known name, *Bunmahon*, in Irish "*Bunmachuine*," marks the village situated at the mouth of the river Mahon, still known in Irish as Machuin. So, too, with the names *Buncrana*, in Donegal; *Bunratty*, in Clare; *Bundoran*, *Bunnamairgey*, and others.

Looking now for some such name in the neighbourhood of the Clyde, we meet, in the Life of St. Cadoc, with the mountain *Bannawe*, near which, it is said, St. Cadoc erected his monastery. This has been identified with the range of hills, now called Catkin, which runs through the parish of Carmunnock, formerly Carmannac, down to the southern bank of the Clyde. The ancient name is still preserved in that of the parish, for in the Cymric dialect B passes into M in combination,\* and thus the name Carmannoc is nothing more than *Caer-Bannauc*. So, too, we have *Bunawe* at the mouth of the *Awe*, where it falls into Loch Etive; and we find also *Banavie* in Lochaber. The latest Scottish writer on the subject, in a paper read before the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland, says:—

As Scotchmen acquainted with the topography of the west country, we can be at no loss to indicate localities in plenty, of which one may have been intended. *Bannave* would answer admirably to denote the mouth of the Leven where it joins the Clyde, and *Taburnia*, or *Tiburnia*, is a designation most appropriate for a river district, or a *ross* placed between two streams. The most probable site for the *Bonaven* of St. Patrick is the confluence of the river *Aven*, or *Avon*, with the main stream of the Clyde, near which the present town of *Hamilton* stands. A more exact correspondence of locality with the name as it has been transmitted to us could not be desired. *Tabernia*, or *Taburnia*, would thus be the present district of *Strathaven*, or the upper course of the Clyde itself, which might well be so designated in reference to the Falls, presenting certainly one of the most striking combinations of beauty and grandeur of natural scenery contained within the bounds of our island.†

The instance here adduced of the river *Aven* or *Avon* which falls from the south into the Clyde seems indeed to bring us to the very name of which we are in search. The valley through which this river flows is still called *Strathaven*. And as the name *Bannave* or *Bonaven* is a generic one, perhaps we should

\* "Four Books of Wales," i. 174.

† Turner, p. 275.

ch have here the reason why St. Patrick, to distinguish it from other villages of the same name, should have called it *Banaven Taberniæ*, and why Probus also should have described it as "the village Bannave in the Tiburnian district." Its distance from Dumbarton does not seem to me an insurmountable difficulty in the case, as it is not at all improbable that the residence of a Roman nobleman like Calphurnius would be situated at some miles distance from the capital of the province. It is deserving of remark that precisely at the confluence of the Clyde and Avon, there exists on the eastern bank of the latter stream an artificial hillock or mound which probably marks the site of an ancient village. Should, however, anyone find a difficulty in accepting this opinion, we must add that the River Clyde was supposed to fall into the sea at Dumbarton; "ad Dunbritton mare subit;"\* and hence it should not surprise us that on that account some village on either bank in the immediate neighbourhood of Alelyde would have received the name Bannave or Bonaven.

6 7. Probus adds one other phrase which serves to define more particularly the territory in which Bannave and Tabernia are to be sought for. He states it was not far from "the Western Sea," "haud procul a mari occidentali." So, too, Jocelyn tells us that Nemthur was a town "bordering on the Irish Sea." Now precisely by these names do we find the sea that separates North Britain from Ireland designated by the early writers. The *Vita Quarta* seems to place this district "juxta mare Tyrreheum," which name generally designates the Mediterranean Sea. In the present text, however, it is probably a mere blunder of the copyist for the Latinized form of the Celtic *Iar* or *Iarthar*, which would be the precise Celtic word used in reference to the Western Sea.

8. The territory of *Nentria* is also a distinctive name which Probus's text presents to us. Mr. Turner makes an ingenious conjecture relative to the origin of this name. "Nentria I believe to be the primal or archetypal name of the district of Strathclyde. . . . It was probably derived from the Cymric *Nant* 'a valley' and *Dwr* 'water,' and the literal meaning would thus be the 'valley of the stream,' Strathclyde being the valley of the Clyde."† To me, however, it appears that Nentria is nothing more than a Latinized form of the name Nentur by which the Britons designated Alelyde, and thus the "Nentria provincia" would mean "the territory of Alelyde." This fortified town being the capital of the Scoto-British kingdom, soon gave its name to the surrounding territory, and we.

\* Camden, "Brittania," p. 666.

† Turner, p. 277.

find its rulers indifferently styled by the old Scotch writers the kings of Strathclyde and the kings of Alclyde.\* It would be pretty much the same as when at the present day we speak of Dumbarton city and Dumbartonshire.

9. We must not omit the descriptive words which are added by Probus "in which (territory) the giants are said to have dwelt in olden times." It is a strange coincidence that in the passage already referred to in the Life of St. Cadoc, it is said that this saint when he visited North Britain and was engaged in erecting his monastery near the mountain, Bannawc, that is in the parish of Carmunnock, found there "the grave of a giant," who when raised to life said he had been king of the territory beyond the mountain Bannawc. We have also seen how the learned author of the "Ogygia," records the Irish tradition that the valley of the Clyde derived the name Taburnia from the great founder and father of the Tuatha Danaans, and that it was precisely from this district that this heroic race passed into Ireland. Now, these Danaans are the giants and heroes of our mythological history: "all the gods of Irish Pagan story are connected with their race."† Their sepulchral mounds at Moturra, in the County of Sligo, and elsewhere, are still popularly known as "the giants' graves."‡

10. We further learn from Probus that at the time that St. Patrick was led into captivity, the British marauders plundered "his city Arimuric and the neighbouring places." It has been generally assumed as a matter of course that these words have reference to Armoric Gaul. It is, indeed, beyond the reach of controversy that the sea-board territory of Gaul was called Armorica; and it is equally certain that it derived its name from the Celtic words, *Ar* "upon," and *moir* or *muir* "the sea." And Camden writes, "Armorica in the old Gaulish and now in the British signifies *by the sea side*." However, there is nothing in the text of Probus to lead us to suppose that he here refers to Armoric Gaul. He speaks not of a territory, but of a city, called by the name of *Arimuric*, and of a city so named there is no trace in Gaul. It seems sufficiently probable that in the present text the city derived its name from the Roman wall or rampart which stretched across the valley of the Clyde, of which we have already spoken. In "Cormac's Glossary" we find *Mur* explained to mean "a rampart."§ Even to the present day we find the name *Dalmuir* attached to the district

\* Skene, "Celtic Scotland," vol. i. p. 235.

† Dr. Matthew Kelly, "Cambrensis Evercus," vol. i. p. 512.

‡ See "Annals of the Four Masters," by Dr. Donovan, ad An. M. 3330, 3370.

§ Stokes "Cormac's Glossary," p. 116.

close to the Old Kilpatrick, on the banks of the Clyde, where the fosse or wall terminated; and at a short distance there is a town called *Dalmuir*, a station on the line of railway between Dumbarton and Glasgow. Some Scottish archaeologists affirm that the name *Dalmuir* corresponds in meaning with the old Celtic *Aridh-muir*, or *Arimuric*. = *Urnaidhe* *Ramp*

11. The name *Hurnia*, given, in N, to the village where St. Patrick was born, is a generic one, and is often met with in Celtic districts. It is derived from the word *urnaidhe*, and is generally used to designate a place of prayer or pilgrimage. Mr. Joyce gives us the following details on this name: "This word, which is variously written *urnaidhe*, *ornaidhe*, or *ernaidhe*, signifies primarily 'a prayer,' but in a secondary sense it is applied to a prayer-house; Latin *oratorium*. It takes most commonly the form *Urney*, which is the name of some parishes and townlands in Cavan, Tyrone, and King's County. The word often incorporates the article in English, and becomes *Nurney*, which is the name of several parishes, villages, and townlands in Carlow and Kildare. It occurs in combination in *Templenhurney*, in Tipperary."\* The town *Nurney* in the County Carlow, is marked *Urney* in the old map of Ireland by Mercator: it was, in former times, a famous place of pilgrimage, and O'Curry writes that "*Urnaidhe*, in this instance, and whenever applied to a church as its name, means *Cillna-hurnaighe*, 'cella orationis.'"† Now from the "*Origines Parrochiales Scotiæ*," we learn that the church at Old Kilpatrick, near Dumbarton, was in olden times a famous place of pilgrimage. Before the twelfth century, Alwin, Earl of Lennox, "confirmed a grant to that church of all the lands of Edinbernian and Baccan, and others," which had been granted by his predecessors; and he added himself the lands of Cateconnen; and from the old deeds which are still preserved, we know that towards the close of the twelfth century these lands were in the possession of a person called "*Beda Ferdan*," who lived at *Monachkenneran*, on the Clyde, "in a large house of wattle;" and of three other persons, all of whom were bound for all service "to receive and entertain the pilgrims coming to the church of St. Patrick."‡ Eng 10

12. Jocelyn mentions the village "*Taburnia*." This perhaps is a mistake for *Urnia*, or it may have been another name for the same place, for it may be explained to mean a place of pilgrimage on the sea coast, which would appropriately be referred to Kilpatrick on the banks of the Clyde. All the other Ja

\* Joyce, "Irish Names," p. 309.

† Ordnance Survey Letters, Co. of Carlow.

‡ "Orig. Par.," i. 20, 501; v. 229.

details given by this writer clearly point to the neighbourhood of Dumbarton as the birth-place of our Apostle.

13. The name *Enon* is in one manuscript of the "Confessio" of St. Patrick given as the name of the villa in which Calphurnius and his family dwelt. This reading, however, is considered very uncertain, not being found in the oldest and most accurate texts. It is, however, a Celtic name, and would mean a villa on the river bank, precisely as we see so many villas at the present day called "river-view" or "sea-view," or some similar name. It may also be remarked that the Cymric *Yddon*, which would be pronounced *Enon* by the Celts, occurs more than once as a proper name in the "Four Books of Wales,"\* and other early records.

I have thus endeavoured, as far as our limits would permit, to illustrate in detail the various places named in the ancient records in connection with the birth-place of our Apostle. They all lead us to the valley of the Clyde, and I have no hesitation in accepting the tradition of the Scottish Church which, from time immemorial, has marked out Old Kilpatrick as the hallowed spot in which St. Patrick was born. The Breviary of Aberdeen, the only proper one of Scotland that has been preserved, gives the seal of authenticity to this venerable tradition: "St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland (we there read), was born of Calphurnius, of illustrious Celtic descent, and his mother was Concessa, from Gaul, a sister of St. Martin, of Tours: he was conceived with many miraculous signs at Dumbarton Castle, but was born and reared at Kilpatrick, in Scotland, near the said castle."† In the Diocese of Glasgow there are no fewer than six ancient parishes dedicated to St. Patrick, and Dr. Forbes gives a list of ten other churches or districts which in various parts of Scotland have honoured St. Patrick as patron. This proves how popular and how widespread was the devotion of the Scottish Church to our Apostle. Kilpatrick on the Clyde is the oldest of these Scottish dedications. It is called Old-Kilpatrick, to distinguish it from another town a few miles more inland, called East Kilpatrick. It gives name to Kylpatrick parish, and has for its limit to the north the range of hills called the Kilpatrick hills. In the "Origines Parrochiales," we read that "of the places in various parts of Scotland, including six parishes in the diocese of Glasgow, which derived their appellation from the Apostle of Ireland, the most ancient and distinguished certainly was Kylpatrick."‡ Its present church only dates from 1793, but as we learn from the

\* Skene, "Four Books," vol. i. p. 434; and vol. ii. p. 432.

† "Brev. Aberdon.," ad diem 17, Mart., fol. lxx. b.

‡ "Orig. Parroch.," vol. i. p. 20.



authority just cited, the church which it supplanted was at that date considered "a very ancient building, and erected on the site of one still more ancient."\* Close to Old Kilpatrick is the plateau called Chapel-hill (formerly united with Kilpatrick) where also St. Patrick's memory is held in benediction, and where the remains of an old Roman town may easily be traced. The holy well, once dedicated to our Apostle, is situated a little to the south of the graveyard, in which the Church now stands, being separated from it, however, by the modern road from Dumbarton to Glasgow. It is probable that this was the well over which the original church was built, and to whose waters miraculous effects are ascribed in several of the old narratives relating to the infancy of our Apostle.

Kilpatrick† was an outpost of the great fortress of Alclyde. The ruins of Roman construction, which still mark the country around, attest its importance in former times. It was here too that the Roman wall or vallum terminated, as the Scottish Antiquaries are now agreed,‡ and four forts, which may still be easily traced, linked the extremity of the wall with the great fortress itself. This will serve to explain to us how it is that the ancient writers may well have named Nemthur or Alclyde as the place of St. Patrick's birth, although it is to Kilpatrick or its immediate neighbourhood that we must look for the precise spot which was rendered illustrious§ by that event. As an outpost it was in a manner identified with the fortress to which it belonged. At the present day, a person living at one of the suburbs or outposts of Paris is justly said to reside in Paris. It was precisely so in the matter of our Apostle's birth. We may take another instance from the references made to the Roman wall, which, as we have seen, terminated at Old Kilpatrick, but which, nevertheless, by the ancient writers, with Venerable Bede, is said to have joined the Clyde, "*juxta urbem Alcluith.*"|| Thus, then, writing at a distance as to time and

\* "Orig." cit. It is added that, in the Clyde opposite the Church, there is a large stone called St. Patrick's Rock; and it is the tradition that St. Patrick's vessel, in full sail, struck on this rock, but sustained no injury.

† "The parish of Kilpatrick has been described in every account as peculiarly rich in Roman antiquities, and we are told on good authority that a sculptured cross, said to have been taken from near the Roman wall, was long used as a foot-bridge over a burn in these latter days of Iconoclasm." "The Labourer," September, 1865, p. 270.

‡ We have already given the words of Skene. Centuries ago Fordun, treating of this wall, had written: "*In ripa fluminis Clude juxta Kirkpatrick terminatur.*" "Scotichron," vol. i. p. 4.

§ A quarter of a century ago local tradition pointed to a ruin at Glenlucet, near Bowling, between Kilpatrick and Dumbarton, as marking the place where St. Patrick was born.

|| Bede, "Eccl. Hist.," vol. i. p. 12.

place, the historians of St. Patrick's life justly stated that he was born at Nemthur or Alclyde; whilst those who wished more particularly to designate the precise spot declared that his birth took place at the town called *Hurnia*, famed as a place of pilgrimage, which, from the special veneration shown there to our Saint in after times became known throughout Scotland as *Kilpatrick*. It is not necessary to repeat here what has been said in the preceding pages, that the other circumstances which refer to St. Patrick's birth-place all harmonize with Kilpatrick: it was situated in the plain of Tabernia, not far from the Western coast and from the Irish Sea, and precisely where, towards the close of the fourth century, we would expect to find the Roman Decurio Calphurnius holding his half civil, half military command.\*

### III.

#### *Remarks on some Modern Theories.*

A few remarks on the other principal theories which have found adherents in later times, will now serve to place in bolder relief the consistency and truth of the opinion which we have here briefly explained.

Don Philip O'Sullivan Bearre, in his "*Patriciana Decas*," advanced the opinion that St. Patrick was born in Bretagne, or Brittany, in France. He was led to adopt this view by the statement of some ancient writers, as well as of several Continental Breviaries, that our Apostle was "*Brito natione*," which words he translated "*a native of Brittany*." Suffice it, however, to remark, that at the time of St. Patrick's nativity, the name of Bretagne, or Brittany, had not been as yet transferred to the shores of Gaul.

Mr. Patrick Lynch, Secretary to the Gaelic Society, contended in his "*Life of St. Patrick*," that Nemtur referred to the city of Tours, in France, and he translated it "*Holy Tours*." For this singular translation, however, he gives no authority. Indeed, there seems to be no reason for assigning a Celtic name to this flourishing city. In early times it was known by its classic name of *Cesarodunum*; and at a later period from the tribe of the Turones, whose capital it was, it was called "*Civitas Turonum*," from which title at a comparatively recent time the modern name was derived.

Dr. Lanigan was the first to contend that we must look to Northern Armoric Gaul for St. Patrick's native town, and, with

\* It is a strange coincidence that as early as the year 162, a general named Calphurnius Agricola was sent to command the Roman troops at the Clyde. See Skene, "*Celtic Scotland*," vol. i. p. 79.



considerable display of historical research endeavoured to prove that the modern Boulogne, in Picardy, was the precise place rendered illustrious by his birth. In his proof he relies mainly on the words of St. Patrick regarding his father, Calphurnius, in the beginning of the "Confessio:"—"Qui fuit a vico Bonaven Taberniæ," from which he thus argues:—

Bonavem or Bonaven was in Armorica Gaul, being the same town as Boulogne-sur-Mer, in Picardy. That town was well known to the Romans as Gessoriacum; but about the reign of Constantine the Great, the Celtic name Bonaven or Bonaun, alias Bonon, which was Latinized into Bononia, became more general. According to Bullet, who informs us that Am, Aven, On, signify a river in the Celtic language, the town was so called from its being at the mouth of a river; *Bon*, mouth, *on* or *avon*, river. Baxter also observes that Bononia is no other than *Bonaven* or *Bonaun*, for *aven*, *avem*, *avon*, *aun*, are pronounced in the same manner. The addition of *Taberniæ* marks its having been in the district of Tarvanna or Tarvenna, alias Tarabanna, a celebrated city not far from Boulogne, the ruins of which still remain under the modern name of Terouanne. The name of this city was extended to a considerable district around it, thence called *pagus Tarbanensis*, *Tarvanensis regio*.\*

Throughout Dr. Lanigan's argument there is this radical defect, that St. Patrick in his "Confessio" does not name *Bonavem Taberniæ* as his birth-place, but only as the place of the family residence, whence he himself was led into captivity. Even, therefore, if it were admitted that Boulogne-sur-Mer was indicated by "*Bonaven Taberniæ*," the historical argument which assigns the birth of St. Patrick to North Britain would remain unimpeached. Two of the ancient writers, in fact, state that our Apostle was led into slavery from Armorica Gaul; but they nevertheless affirm that he was born at Alelyde, and that his family, having gone from North Britain on business to Gaul, he was there made captive. Moreover, the etymological derivation of Bononia is not without its difficulties. Some, with Cluverius, wish it rather to be derived from the name Buenen, by which the Northern tribes of Belgic Gaul designated it; others derive it from the name of the river on which the city stands, which is now called the Liane, but it was known to the Romans as "*Fluvius Enna*," under which name it is marked on the ancient maps. This is also the name given to it by Malbrancq. Should either of these derivations be admitted, it would be vain to endeavour to refer Bonaven to Boulogne-sur-Mer.

But another insuperable difficulty here presents itself. How

---

\* Lanigan, "Eccl. Hist.," vol. i. p. 93.

could the term *vicus* be applied to Bononia in those early times? And we must remark that, as well by St. Patrick in his "Confessio" as by Probus, this phrase is used—"e vico Bannave." Surely Bononia at the time we treat of was not a mere village, or *vicus*, but was rather an *oppidum insigne*—indeed, one of the most important towns of Northern Gaul. It had long been the chief military station of the Roman armies in Armoric Gaul. There they had marshalled their troops for the invasion of Britain. Carausius had made it the capital of his Empire in the West. Constantine, too, had for awhile sojourned there. A short time before St. Patrick's birth the Emperor Julian, the Apostate, had made it his headquarters in his expedition into Gaul. The remains of the Roman buildings which once adorned it still attest its importance. In the year 449 it was able to repel the assault of Attila. It was not till the ninth century, when it was destroyed by the Normans, that it ceased to be reckoned among the chief towns of France.\*

Being thus a place of importance, both civil and military, its name was clearly defined. No names were more familiar than those of Gessoriacum† and Bononia; and St. Patrick, wishing to be understood, would assuredly have employed, not an archaic form, which centuries before might possibly have been in use, but the ordinary name by which the place was known to every one at the time when he wrote. Often as the city is referred to by ancient and mediæval writers, there is not a trace of the name *Bannave* or *Bonavem* having ever been used to designate it.

But in Dr. Lanigan's hypothesis what becomes of the second name, *Taberniæ*? We may pass over the singular mistake of our historian, who confounds together Tarvanna and Tervanna, though the former was the ancient name of Therouanne, thirty miles from Boulogne; whilst the latter designated the modern town of St. Pol, which is twenty miles farther on.‡ Both places were, however, of far less importance than Boulogne, and there is not a shadow of proof that the "*regio Tarvanensis*" ever extended to the sea-coast. But Dr. Lanigan contends that some such additional designation was necessary in order that the Bononia to which St. Patrick referred might be distinguished from Bononia in Italy and elsewhere. This might be true, indeed, if St. Patrick had made use of the name Bononia; but surely no one would ever have dreamt of applying the name Bannave

\* See "Statistique Monumentale du Département du Pas de Calais," Arras, 1840; also "Congrès Archéologique de France," 27<sup>e</sup> session, 1860, &c.

† Two centuries and a half later, it was called Gessoriacum by Venerable Bede, "H. Eccl.," Book i. p. 1.

‡ Paulinati, "Comitum Tervanensium Annales," cited by Hoey, p. 123.

to the Italian city; and were some distinctive designation required, is it not some such term as *Marittima*, or *Gallica*, or *Armorica*, that would be applied to the seaport town, and not the unheard-of name, *Tabernia*?

Dr. Lanigan appeals also to the authority of Probus, but it is only by introducing a very important change into the genuine text of Probus that he brings it to bear on his novel theory. Probus, as we have seen, writes: "*Quem vicum (Bannave) indubitanter comperimus esse Nentriæ provinciae.*" Dr. Lanigan, however, without assigning any reason, thus cites the text: "*Quem vicum indubitanter comperimus esse Nevtriæ provinciae,*" and from the *Nevtria* thus introduced into the text he concludes that, according to Probus, the village Bannave was situated in the province of Neustria, in Gaul;\* and that the same Neustria is indicated in all the various texts which refer to Nemthur. All this, however, falls to the ground when we look to the authentic text of Probus, in which the "*Nentria provinciae*" admits of no explanation except that which we have given in the preceding pages. Even if we were to suppose that *Nevtria* was the genuine reading of this text, we should interpret it as a mere aspirated form of the Celtic *Nemthur*, and it should follow the interpretation already given of that name. It cannot, however, by any possibility, be referred to Neustria, a name<sup>X</sup> which began to be used only in the sixth century, and which French philologists derive from "*Neuest reich*," the new kingdom which was formed in the north-west of Gaul, whilst Austrasia occupied the north-eastern territory.

Mr. Cashel Hoey, in an interesting paper read before the London Academia of the Catholic Religion,† adopts for the most part the opinion of Dr. Lanigan. Whilst, however, he admits that Baunave designates the modern Boulogne, he contends that *Tabernia* is to be sought for in the town of Desvres, which in the Middle Ages was Latinized *Divernia*, and pursuing the same etymological line of reasoning, he turns *Nemthur* into *Tournaheim*, and he identifies with the town Enna, not far from Desvres, the small villa Enon, which in one MS. is introduced into the text of St. Patrick's "*Confessio.*" This theory does not explain away any of the difficulties that we have met with, in Dr. Lanigan's opinion; on the contrary, it only makes the confusion still more confused. Desvres is an obscure village about fifteen miles from Boulogne. It was known in ancient times as *Divonia*; for the name *Divernia* is nothing more than a very late attempt to give a classical Latin form to the modern French name Desvres. But strangest of all, as, according to Mr. Hoey,

\* Lanigan, "*Ecel. Hist.*," vol. i. p. 102.

† Hoey, "*On the Birth-place of St. Patrick*," "*Essays*," &c., p. 106.

St. Patrick was born at Bonaven Taberniæ, we must be ready to admit that Boulogne and Tournehem are the same place, and that Enna is close by Boulogne, though it is in reality close by Desvres. Before, however, we dismiss this theory, I must warn the reader against a statement made by Mr. Hoey: "The opinion," he says, "that St. Patrick was born in France has always had a traditional establishment in Ireland. It is asserted in one of the oldest of his Lives, that of St. Eleran, and indicated in another, that of Probus."\* Now the text of Probus has not a syllable to indicate any such opinion. The words which Mr. Hoey, improving on Dr. Lanigan's reading, assigns to Probus: "Quem vicum indubitanter comperimus esse Neustriæ provinciæ," may contain, indeed, some such reference, but they are not the words of Probus. And as regards St. Eleran, we have already given his text in full (see F. above); and although the author traces our Apostle's descent from those who dwelt in Armoric Gaul, yet he clearly and expressly states that his parents lived in Strath-Clyde, and that his native town was Nemthor in the plain of Tabern. Thus Mr. Hoey's reference to these two texts is plainly incorrect.

MM. Hancock and O'Mahony, editors of the second volume of the "Brehon Laws," affirm that St. Patrick was born in the neighbourhood of Bristol.† Their argument is one of the most illogical that has been of late years advanced in historical matters. Nemthur, they say, is identified, by the scholiast of the "Book of Hymns," with Alclyde. Now, the name Caer-Britton, given to Alclyde by the Roman-British writers, was also given to Bristol in the early Roman times. They, therefore, conclude that Nemthur, St. Patrick's birth-place, was none other than Bristol. This whole argument, as is manifest, hinges on the testimony of the scholiast of the "Book of Hymns." Now, this ancient writer does not affirm that our Apostle was born at Caer-Britton, which might, perhaps, justify in some way the line of reasoning which these writers have pursued; but he expressly states that his birth took place at "Alclyde, in North Britain." Suffice it to say that Bristol was not Alclyde, neither was it situated in North Britain.

There are two other theories which, though they do not directly refer to the question of which we now treat, yet cannot be passed over in the present controversy, for they seem, indirectly at least, to cut away the ground from under the position which we have taken. The first of these has been broached by Mr. Nicholson,‡ who on mere visionary grounds pushes back

\* "Essays," &c., p. 110.

† "Ancient Laws of Ireland," vol. ii. (Dublin, 1867), p. xxii.

‡ "St. Patrick, Apostle of Ireland," by R. Steele Nicholson, p. 3.

the date of St. Patrick's birth to the first quarter of the third century, and places his mission to Ireland in the year 254. This theory has nothing to commend it. Its avowed purpose is polemical, for Mr. Nicholson desires his readers to understand that St. Patrick had made our people a nation of Protestants in the third century, and that Palladius was sent to Ireland by the Pope in the fifth century to bring them from Protestantism into the pale of the Catholic Church. If the date thus assigned to St. Patrick's mission were true, it would undoubtedly be vain to look for Calphurnius, a Christian Deacon, holding the office of Roman Decurio in the frontier city of Alclwyde, early in the third century; but whilst glaring inconsistencies are met with at every step in this theory, one argument alone will suffice to refute it. Mr. Nicholson, when citing the "Book of Armagh," finds it necessary in order to preserve some appearance of truth for his theory to deliberately alter the ancient text which he professes to cite. Among the headings of the Annotations of Bishop Aedh, we find the following in the "Book of Armagh" (fol. 20, a. 1):—

De etate ejus quando iens videre sedem apostolicam voluit discere sapientiam.

De inventione Sancti Germani in Galliis et ideo non exivit ultra. . . . .

De ordinatione ejus ab Amothorege Episcopo, defuncto Palladio.

Now, the second of these headings is thus altered by Mr. Nicholson: "De inventione sancti generis in Galliis et ideo non exivit ultra:" which he translates: "Concerning his finding a holy set of men in Gaul, and that, therefore, he went no farther."\* It is not thus, however, that history is written. When such a deliberate alteration of an authentic text is found necessary to give some colour of consistency to a cherished theory, such theory stands self-condemned. The place of St. Germanus is clearly defined in the history of the Church; and it is sufficiently manifest that if St. Patrick was at the school of this great Saint in the fifth century, he could not have flourished as a great Christian missionary towards the middle of the third century. It is strange, however, that Mr. Nicholson did not advert to the fatal blow which is given to his theory by the concluding words of Bishop Aedh, who, so far from antedating the mission of St. Patrick two centuries before Palladius, expressly attests that it was not till after the death of Palladius that St. Patrick was consecrated for the Apostolate of our people.

The second theory to which I wish to refer has been quite recently advanced by the Rev. I. F. Shearman, in his work

\* Nicholson, p. 24.

entitled "*Loca Patriciana*." Whilst, however, I reject Mr. Shearman's theory, far be it from me to say one word disparaging him or the valuable work with which he has enriched our Ecclesiastical literature. He has in many of its chapters rendered important services to the hagiology of the Irish Church, and by his unwearying toil in illustrating many obscure passages in the lives of our early saints, he is justly entitled to the gratitude of all students of the Ecclesiastical history of our country. But in the subject now before us, he has undoubtedly allowed his mature judgment to be outrun by a very fanciful theory. For fourteen centuries Ireland has honoured St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, as her chief Apostle. Now, however, Mr. Shearman tells us that we have been quite mistaken. The Apostle of our country, if his theory is true, was another saint of the name of Patrick, commonly designated in the Celtic records, St. Sen-Patrick, that is, St. Patrick Senior. It was only at a later period that St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, entered on the mission field; but, for some reason which it is not easy to understand, and which Mr. Shearman makes no attempt to assign, the writers of our early Church transferred to the later missionary all the important facts which belonged to the career of the real Apostle St. Sen-Patrick. If all this be true, our past inquiry will have been made in vain, for the St. Patrick of whose birth-place we have been in search was Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, whom, in Mr. Shearman's opinion, we have undeservedly styled the Apostle of Erin. Let it not be said that I have in any way exaggerated Mr. Shearman's theory; on the contrary, his own words seem to me far more forcible, when he writes, that the old authors whom we have cited "shut out from view the *real* Apostle Sen-Patrick, consigning him to obscurity and to an almost historical extinction."\*

It would be out of place in our present inquiry to enter, at any length, on the refutation in detail of this singular theory. We have only to view it as it bears on the subject now before us; but whosoever calmly considers it under this respect, must unhesitatingly conclude that it arbitrarily ignores every record of our country's history, and is inconsistent with the witness of the Irish Church, for fourteen hundred years, as to the Father and Chief Apostle of our Faith.

The true place of St. Sen-Patrick is clearly defined in our early Celtic records. He was a native of Wales, and he adorned the schools and monasteries of that country by his learning and virtues. He was even for a time the tutor of our great Apostle, and was associated with him in evangelizing our people, but

---

\* "*Loca Patriciana*," p. 434, note.

towards the close of life returned to his native Wales : a portion of his relics were in after times enshrined at Glastonbury ; another portion being preserved in Armagh. Whilst, however, his merits are thus extolled, there is not in any one of the Irish writers the smallest trace of his being considered the Apostle of our country.\* On the other hand, all our writers are agreed in this, that St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, was Ireland's Apostle ; and they reckon it as St. Sen-Patrick's greatest eulogy that he was "the tutor of our Apostle." See how clearly the most ancient and venerable of our martyrologists, St. Ængus, in his "*Feliré*," assigns to each of these saints his proper place. On the 24th of August, the festival of St. Sen-Patrick, the following strophe commemorates his fame :—

With the relation of the host of Srenath (*i.e.* Glastonbury),  
Whose history is made illustrious,  
Sen-Patrick, a battle chief,  
The amiable preceptor of our Patron.

But, on the 17th of March, St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, is thus commemorated :—

The blaze of a noble sun,  
The Apostle of undefiled Erinn,  
Patrick, with many thousands,  
The bulwark of our poor people.

The testimony of St. Ængus should alone suffice to set at rest all question as to the apostolate of St. Patrick, son of Calphurnius. The "*Feliré*" was written in the eighth century. Its author, St. Ængus had devoted his life to the study of the lives of the saints of Erin, and hence this work, which has been handed down to us in authentic MSS. of the most venerable antiquity, bears with it an unquestionable authority.

So, too, another Irish martyrologist of illustrious repute, Marianus O'Gorman, in his "*Metrical Calendar*," whilst, on the 24th August, he merely gives the name of the Senior St. Patrick, on the 17th of March styles St. Patrick, son of Calphurnius :

Patrick, Apostle of Erinn,  
Head of the faith of the Goedhil.

In the "*Leabhar Breac*" (fol. 99, b. 1), there is a brief chrono-

---

\* Mr. Shearman's only authority is the Iolo MSS., with some bardic traditions of Wales. These MSS. and traditions, however, belong to a very late age, none of them dating earlier than the fifteenth century. We are not to be surprised that some of the Welsh writers would exaggerate the merits of their countryman, and ascribe to him some of the facts which belong to the Apostle of Ireland.



logical treatise, which is held in high repute by our antiquarians.\* It thus begins: "We ought to know at what time Patrick, the holy bishop, and chief preceptor of the Scoti, began to come to Ireland to preach and baptize, and to resuscitate the dead and to cure all diseases, and to banish all the demons from Ireland, and to sanctify and consecrate, and to ordain and bless," &c.: and subsequently it designates him of whom it speaks, "Patrick, the son of Calphurn;" and it adds the testimony of St. Eleran, surnamed the Wise, who died at a great old age, in the year 664: "Here is the character given by Eleran of Patrick, when he brought an account of him to the religious of Clonard:

Meek and great was the son of Calphurn,  
A vine branch bearing fruit.

The liturgy of our early Church also bears witness to the same St. Patrick, who is honoured on the 17th of March, being the Apostle of our people. In the "*Missale Vetus Hibernicum*," published a few months ago by Mr. Warren from the MSS. of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, the following prayer is given for St. Patrick's Feast on that day:—

O God, who in Thy Providence didst choose St. Patrick, Apostle of the Scoti, to lead the Irish nations (*Hibernenses gentes*) who were wandering in darkness and in the errors of Paganism, unto the true light of the knowledge of God, and to make them by the laver of regeneration, sons of the Most High God, grant we beseech Thee through his pious intercession that we may hasten without delay to those things that are holy, through Jesus Christ our Lord.†

The most ancient of our annalists, Tighearnach, is equally clear on this point. The earlier entries registered in his *Annals* have been more than once questioned by our ablest writers, on account of the conflicting texts presented in various MSS., but regarding the death of St. Patrick, the son of Calphurn, its genuineness is recognized by all. Tighearnach marks it under the year A.D. 493, and styles the Saint "*Patricius Archiepiscopus et Apostolus Hibernensium*," and adds the quatrain, which even in his time was considered ancient:—

From the birth of Christ, a pleasant period,  
Four hundred above fair ninety,  
Three noble years after that  
To the death of Patrick, chief Apostle.‡

---

\* It is printed in Irish with a translation by Petrie, "*History of Tara*," p. 74.

† Warren, "*The MS. Irish Missal*," London, 1879, p. 150.

‡ See Petrie, "*History of Tara*," p. 88.



Moreover, the various writers who have already attested for us the birth of St. Patrick in North-Britain, leave no doubt as to the apostolate of him to whose birth-place they refer. Thus St. Fiacc's Hymn, whilst registering St. Patrick's birth at Nemthur, in the 4th strophe styles him "the son of Calpuirn," and in the subsequent strophes sets forth as his eulogy that he brought "the people of Ireland from evil to life," that till Patrick preached to the "Scoti the sons of Eme<sup>o</sup> and Emeron were in perdition," and "Until the Apostle came to them, on Ireland's people was darkness, the peoples adored false gods."\*

The Vita Secunda, though it is incomplete, sufficiently indicates St. Patrick's apostolate when it attests that, not to Palladius, but to him, was given the conversion of our people.

The Vita Tertia tells us that Calphurnius was St. Patrick's father, and it adds the following eulogy of our Saint: "The Lord sent to this island this missionary St. Patrick, glowing with the fire of the Holy Spirit, that he might give life to our hearts, and convert us from darkness to light; and when all the Apostles will assemble with their peoples on Judgment Day, St. Patrick will go before us: for, he is given us as our Leader by God, he is our Pastor, our Judge, our Father, our Apostle."†

The Vita Quarta, in the fifteenth chapter, affirms that it was so arranged by a benign Providence that St. Patrick would be led a captive to our shores, that thus "he might learn, in his youth, the language of the nation whose Apostle he was destined one day to be."

Probus, at the very outset, states that St. Patrick was the son of Calphurnius; and in the subsequent chapters, repeatedly declares that he was our spiritual Father, the Apostle of our nation (chapter 32), by whose labours the faith of Christ filled the whole land, "fides Christi omnia nostra loca implevit" (chapter 26).

In the preface to the first part of the Tripartite Life, St. Patrick, the son of Calphurn, is called "one of those rays by which Jesus Christ, the Sun of Justice, has illumined the universe, the glowing and bright shining lamp of the Western world, the Father of the faith and of the spiritual life of the Irish people (Pater fidei et spiritualis regenerationis Hibernorum‡)." Almost the same words are repeated in the Life of our Apostle in the "Leabhar Breac:" "The people that sat in darkness beheld a great light: they that were in the land and in the shadow of death found a light whence came their illumination. . . . Now one of the splendours which the Sun of

\* See Stokes, "Goidelica," p. 131.

† Colgan, "Acta," p. 29.

‡ Colgan. "Acta," p. 117.

Righteousness shed upon the world was the splendour and the flame, the precious stone and shining lamp which enlightened the West of the world, *Sanctus Patricius Episcopus*, to wit, holy Patrick, high Bishop of the West of the world, father of the Baptism and belief of the men of Ireland.”\*

But what should of itself suffice to set this question at rest, we may appeal to the witness of St. Patrick himself. In his “*Confessio*,”† which is now admitted by all authorities to be one of the most authentic and most precious records that have come down to us from the early centuries of our faith, he pours out his soul in thanksgiving to God for the wondrous mercies vouchsafed to him; and among these mercies and the blessings accorded to his humble ministry, he expressly mentions his mission to our people, and the conversion of Ireland from the darkness of Paganism to the holy light of Christian truth: “For I am truly a debtor to God (he thus writes), who has given me such grace, that many people should be born again to God through me, and that among them everywhere there should be ordained priests for this people newly come to the faith. . . . Wherefore behold how in Ireland they who never had the knowledge of God, and hitherto only worshipped unclean idols, have lately become the people of the Lord, and are called the sons of God . . . . What shall I render to Him for all the things that he hath rendered to me; but what shall I say or promise to my Lord? For I see nothing unless He gives it Himself to me; but He who searches the heart and reins knows that I ardently desire and am ready that He should give me to drink His chalice, as He has permitted others to do who have loved Him. Wherefore, may it never be permitted by my Lord that I should lose my people whom He has gained in the ends of the earth.”

Thus, then, we have an uninterrupted tradition handed down from age to age, and beginning with the very first century of our nation’s faith, that St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, was the Apostle of our people. In Mr. Shearman’s theory, two things should be explained: First, how it is that the Irish Church, so remarkable for its love and reverence for the sainted Fathers of its faith, should have so completely ignored the life and the memory of its true Apostle: and secondly, how it could have come to pass that the various writers who chronicled the deeds of St. Patrick, sixty-six of whom are referred to by Jocelyn and by the “*Leabhar Breac*,” should have conspired to assign to one

---

\* Stokes, “Three Middle-Irish Homilies,” 1877, p. 5.

† We have seen already how, in the very commencement of the “*Confessio*,” he declares himself the son of Calphurnius, “*patrem habui Calphurnium*.”

who was not our Apostle, the gesta, and the miracles, and the Life of the true Apostle.\*

There were, undoubtedly, many saints of the name of Patrick in the early Irish Church ; so, too, there were many Bridgets, yet one stands forth alone the Patroness of Ireland. At least four St. Patricks may be reckoned in the very first age of our country's faith ; and yet, what is most remarkable, all of them receive some distinguishing epithet except *the one*. There is Palladius, otherwise called Patrick ; there is St. Patrick, known as Patrick Senior ; there is a little later St. Patrick Junior ; one alone is *the* Patrick, who requires no such distinguishing epithet, but is always honoured pre-eminently as the Father of our Faith : this is St. Patrick, the son of Calphurnius, who, by his sanctity and fruitful missionary toil merited to be styled the Apostle of Erin, whose birth-place we have endeavoured to illustrate in the preceding pages.

PATRICK F. MORAN,  
*Bishop of Ossory.*

---

## ART. II.—HISTORY OF THE PRUSSIAN "KULTURKAMPF."

### PART II.

#### LEGISLATION OF THE YEARS 1873 AND 1874.

**A**LTHOUGH the designs in contemplation at Berlin against the Catholic Church were kept as secret as possible, the events of the year 1872 showed plainly enough that nothing favourable was to be expected. Before the close of that year, indeed, the Prussian Government had given unmistakable signs of intended warfare. The deputies, Reichensperger and Mallinkratt, had addressed to the Government the interpellations : "By what pretext it was prepared to justify the banishment of Religious Orders of women from the public schools ?" and further : "Whether the Government were still minded to compel the Roman Catholic pupils of the gymnasium at

---

\* The reader must be cautious in accepting Mr. Shearman's references. For instance, under the birth of St. Patrick Senior in A.D. 372, we have the reference to "Chronicon Mariani" ("Loca Patr.," p. 434). Now Marianus gives, indeed, in that year the birth of St. Patrick, but expressly adds that it was St. Patrick, the son of Calphurn. The following is the entry of Marianus : "Sanctus Patricius nascitur in Britannia insula ex patre nomine Calpurn : presbiter fuit ipse Calpurn, filius diaconi nomine Fotid. Mater autem erat Patricii Conchess, Soror Sancti Martini de Gallia." (Vatic. MS.)

Braunsberg to submit to religious instruction from an Old-Catholic priest?" The debate upon both questions took place on the 27th and 28th of November.

The reply of the Minister Falk was as arrogant as if the Catholic Church had already forfeited her rights. He charged her with forcing on a conflict with the State, from which he himself, however, would not shrink, provided the people were prepared to stand by the Government. He insisted that "the Church, in common with everything else that belonged to the State, should bend to State legislation." He contended that the secular power should exercise the right of "examining for itself whether a priest excommunicated by his bishop were actually excluded from the communion of the Church." The Old-Catholic priest, Wollmann, concerning whom the question arose, he declared to be a member of the Catholic Church in spite of the excommunication formally and canonically pronounced against him. These views of the Minister, on receiving legal sanction in Prussia, would not only put an end to the liberty of the Church, but threaten her very existence. A prompt and decided remonstrance was returned by Mallinkradt, to the effect that "by this declaration the Government was opening a campaign not only with the party of the Centre, nor merely against Ultramontaniam, but against the entire Catholic Church."

The Protestant parties—Conservatives as well as Liberals—hailed with loud and eager applause the prospect of war with the Church. Diversities of opinion, and even hostility of principle generally, which formerly divided Prussian Conservatives and Liberals, disappeared in the common hatred of Rome. "Herod and Pilate," said the Catholics, derisively, "had again made friends with each other, as formerly in the condemnation of Our Blessed Lord." And so indeed it was. Throughout the land, the organs of Protestantism hounded each other on against the Church, unchecked by the least effort or remonstrance on the part of the Government. "The State was bound," said they, "to supervise the entire organization of the Roman Church, and especially to insist upon the subservience of the Clergy. All question of leaving the Church to go her own way would be high treason to the future of Prussia. These opinions, according to all appearance, were fully shared by the Government. Without any consideration for the interests of the parishes, and without mercy or regard for the much oppressed nuns, the teaching Sisters were driven from the primary schools. The law against the Jesuits was enforced with almost brutal recklessness. Scholastics then studying at Prussian Universities were not even allowed to continue their

studies; and, on the 23rd of November, the authorities at Münster threatened to "intern" four Scholastics if, by the 1st of December, they had not quitted the place. In the province of Posen the Government went so far as to interdict the Devotions to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Further decrees of persecution were also announced.

To all appearance, the designs of Bismarck met, at that time, with direct opposition on the part of the Emperor William; neither had the "alliance of the three Emperors," concluded a few months previously, sufficed to make matters smooth. The permission sought and obtained by Bismarck, at the close of the year, for release from public office, was universally attributed to the opposition of the Emperor to the proposed State interference in ecclesiastical matters. It is possible, therefore, that this disposition on the part of His Majesty might have prevented the prosecution of further measures, had not the Pope's Christmas Allocution been made use of to arouse his susceptibilities.

The approach of the heavy storm, threatening to lay waste the Church in Prussia, was felt throughout the whole Catholic world, and, from all parts, words of encouragement and consolation were addressed to the faithful in that country. The Bishops of England were foremost in salutations to their German brethren; the steadfast endurance of the German episcopate rejoiced their hearts as "*consanguinitate supernaturali per gloriosum Germaniæ apostolum ejusdem familiæ consortes.*" Writing from a land watered by the blood of martyrs for the freedom of the Church, they could say with truth, "*ii qui ecclesiam Catholicam vel aperte vel subdole persequuntur, omnimodæ libertatis matrem in servitutem conantur redigere.*"

On the eve of Christmas the voice of the Chief Pastor was also raised. Pius IX. reprimanded the newly-formed German Empire in terms so precise and distinct as to leave no doubt of his apprehension of the danger, and his desire that it should be fully realized. "In Germany," said he, "men seek to uproot the Church from her very foundations, combating her not by secret wiles alone, but by open force. Persons who not only are not numbered amongst the followers of our holy religion, but are entirely ignorant of her principles, arrogate to themselves the power of defining both the dogmas and rights of the Church."

Protestants were in the habit of ridiculing the Pope as a weak old man, whose words could have no possible force or influence beyond the walls of the Vatican; nevertheless, the utterances of this aged and feeble priest aroused a storm of fury, almost incomprehensible in those who had seemed scarcely to believe in

the Pope's existence. A similar temper was displayed by the Government. The passage above quoted from the Papal Allocution was everywhere diffused by means of the official telegraph offices; whilst, with mendacious hypocrisy, was added: "Consideration for His Majesty forbids our rendering the full sense of the words in German." Those newspapers which had published the entire text of the Allocution were prosecuted. This proceeding on the part of the Minister of Police was denounced as a mistake by the Press, as well as by the Landtag. They did not perceive that the one aim of the manœuvre was to excite the anger of the Emperor. Mallinkrath saw through it, however, and expressed his conviction in a few trenchant words to the Minister Eulenburg: "The object of the 'powers that be' is to make men believe that the majesty of the Emperor has been assailed, and that reparation is due to the injured feelings of the nation." The Ministers were not out in their reckoning. The Emperor gave his consent to the recall of young Lieutenant Stumm, the last representative of the former Prussian Embassy to the Holy See. Moreover, on the 8th of January, 1873, he accepted the draft of the Bill which was to regulate the relations of the Catholic Church to the State, and to "chastise the insolence of Rome."

On the 9th of January, the draft of the proposed legislation was laid, by Falk, before the Chamber of Deputies, with a request for speedy consideration, in order that the laws might come into force during the present Session, and so "the way be prepared for a firm and lasting peace." The slight sketch given by the Minister sufficed to assure the Liberals of the importance of the blow aimed at the liberty and independence of the Church; he was rewarded, therefore, by loud applause from that side of the House. The Protestant Conservatives, however, were silent, inasmuch as, from the legislation proposed, they could not but apprehend dangers also to the "Evangelical" Church. As for the Catholic members, they saw at a glance all that was involved. "It has been announced," said Mallinkrath, "that the object of the new laws is to bring about a firm and lasting peace. In reality, however, the object of the Bill is to establish, by external servility and internal revolution, and the consequent dissolution of the Catholic Church in this country, the peace of the grave." A stern sentence, this; but its truth was felt by every Catholic in the land.

By the rules of the new legal articles, ecclesiastical offices were to be conferred on those of the clergy only who had been educated at German universities, or in one of the seminaries recognised by the Minister. At the conclusion of their studies, candidates for the ecclesiastical office were to be examined by



Commissioners of the State in classics, philosophy, history, and literature. All ecclesiastical institutions for the training of the clergy were to be placed under State control. The Chief President of the province in which any such institution existed was to have the right of giving or withholding his approval of the regulations of the house, as well as of the plan of instruction. The *petits séminaires*, enjoined by the Council of Trent, were to be entirely suppressed.

The Chief President was to have the right of protest against the appointment as well as removal of all clergymen whatever. The bishop, it is true, was entitled to appeal to the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs against this protest, but he was bound to abide by the Minister's decision. The protest of the Chief President, moreover, was to stand good "when it was evident that the person in question was unsuited to the office from reasons appertaining to the claims of citizenship." On the occurrence of any ecclesiastical vacancy, it was to be definitively filled up within the space of twelve months. The power of enforcing clerical discipline was to be exercised by a court of *German* ecclesiastics only, whilst appeal to the State was open in all cases. Corrective measures with regard to the clergy were also to be subject to the control of the Government, and in no instance to be carried out contrary to State regulation, or decrees of the magistrates. Ecclesiastics whose continuance in their posts seemed to be incompatible with public regulations were to be deposed by a court of justice appointed *ad hoc*.

The Catholics of Prussia, though prepared for evil, had scarcely expected treatment such as this. Newspapers, though hostile to the Church, which retained any feeling for liberty, denounced these projects as "a relapse into sheer absolutism, and as the offspring of a fanciful bureaucracy, calculated to destroy the last traces of constitutional principles." At the same time, however, little doubt was entertained by Catholics of the assent of the majority to the new legislation, and of its being ultimately carried into effect. In the words of Windthorst, in the Chamber of Deputies, they were convinced that, "just as the Christians of the first centuries could not submit to the unlawful demands of Pagan supremacy, even so Christians of to-day were bound to withhold their submission to unjust and conscience-violating laws." That indescribable misfortune was hanging over the Church in Prussia was evident to all; but Catholics took comfort in the thought that, after all, the enemies and persecutors of the Church were mortal, and that the help of Almighty God would be given in His good time. Was it a happy presage that, on the very day on which Falk, by order of his master, Prince Bismarck, laid before the House the sketch of the pro-

posed legislation, Napoleon III., exiled and abandoned by his countrymen, was breathing his last in an unpretending chamber at Chislehurst? "Bismarck is assuredly no mightier than was Napoleon," said Catholics to each other.

To every thinking mind it was clear as day that the projected laws were a violation of the Statutes of the Prussian Constitution. It had been laid down by Article 15 "that the Evangelical and Roman Catholic Churches should be entitled to the independent regulation and administration of their affairs." Article 18 had pronounced the State to have nothing to do with the "appointment to ecclesiastical offices, either by nomination, selection, or confirmation." The very contrary was now decreed, inasmuch as the Church was, in every particular, to be subordinate to the State. "They propose to frame a code for enslaving the Church," remarked Reichensperger. In his speech on the introduction of the Bill, Falk suggested to the special consideration of the Deputies the question, whether a revision of the Constitution might not be necessary; an indiscreet suggestion, but one which met with much approval from the Liberal majority in the House. The existing Constitution had restored freedom to the Catholic Church in Prussia; that was sufficient reason for the Protestant parties to be eager for a change which might bring the Church into bondage. By the Catholic members the danger of such a step was vigorously demonstrated. Herr von Mallinkrath warned conscientious Protestants "to beware of making common cause with those who, by virtue of their principles, were the deadly enemies of *authority of every kind.*" The special aim contemplated was, indeed, the annihilation of the Catholic Church; "but," he continued, "in a few years the State will have attained to absolute despotism over all that is most sacred to human nature. Liberalism will then find itself yoked to the car of Absolutism; once let the people take part in this triumphal procession, and immediately Liberalism will cease to exist." The warning was, however, in vain. Prussian Liberalism held itself immortal, and laughed at every suggestion of possible dissolution. With a temerity, characterized afterwards by Windthorst as "blasphemous," the reporter, Gneist, appealed to "the decision of eternal justice; inasmuch as the matter in question was one so pleasing to God as resistance to the decrees of the Vatican Council." Falk intimated his approval, adding that, "after much conflict and serious consideration with itself and with God, the Government had decided on taking this course." No one either within or without the House gave heed to this assertion. At Court it may, possibly, have met with some belief. The opinion of Catholics was expressed by the sarcastic speech of Windthorst: "It would be

well simply to do away with the Constitution altogether; and, in each case as it occurs, legislate according as the circumstances, considerations, and *passions* of the moment shall suggest."

The alteration of Articles 15 and 18 of the Constitutional Code was definitively settled on the 1st of March, 1873. In accordance therewith, the Catholic Church was still to maintain the right of independent administration of her own affairs, "*subject*," however, "*to the legally ordained supervision of the State*." The right of the State to the "appointment, selection, and confirmation" of candidates to ecclesiastical offices, was also to remain *suspended*; "*for the rest, however, the claims of the State with regard to the training, appointment, and dismissal of the clergy, along with the right of defining the limits of ecclesiastical discipline, were to be regulated by law*."

These additions were in direct opposition to the spirit of the original Articles, which were thereby, not changed, but simply cancelled.

The debate upon the revision of the Constitution was opened in the Upper Chamber on the 10th of March. The representatives of the old nobility—even those who were Protestants—vigorously opposed the attempt upon the liberties of the Church. The position of the defenders of the motion was, indeed, an exceedingly difficult one, inasmuch as they could produce no real grounds for a change in the Constitution. Count Landsberg called the attention of the House to the Bill in the following terms: "It is customary to introduce the proposal of a law by the demonstration of its necessity; I ask you, then, to consider the Bill in question. The first page is filled merely with information concerning the resolutions of the Chamber of Deputies; upon the second, there is nothing at all; the project in question is contained on the third page, and the fourth is again a blank."

It was not to be wondered at that those of the Upper Chamber who were chosen from among the "Professors" should found the necessity for a revision of the Constitution on the proclamation of the dogma of Papal Infallibility. A short time previously, Herr von Mallinkrath had defined the situation as the war of the Professors against the Church. But it seems strange that a man of so much intelligence and general experience as the Minister Count Roon, should condescend to a similar pretext, and say, "The claim to infallibility on the part of a human being is the occasion of the strife in which we are engaged." This chord once struck, it was echoed loudly and repeatedly by the Church's opponents. "We must have weapons against the Infallibility," was the cry of the Liberal

Burgomasters in the Upper House. It was said by others yet more clearly, "We must be on the defensive against the usurpations of a foreign Power, against the arrogant claims of the Roman Curia; by so doing we secure the consciences of our countrymen against the crime of deifying a man."

The House seemed to have completely lost sight of the fact that more than eight millions of the population of Prussia were Roman Catholics; an oversight which drew from Count Landsberg an outburst of noble indignation. "It seems," said he, "that the learned men of the day have no time to read through the Catholic Catechism; German Catholics cling closely to Rome, and will cling the closer the more obstacles are put in their way."

Prince Bismarck, who was present at the deliberations simply in his Ministerial capacity, ventured upon illustrating the dangers threatening Prussia from Papal influence by historical analogies; of so weak a nature, however, that it seemed doubtful whether they were made in earnest. "The conflict in which we are engaged," said the Chancellor, "is one between the kingly power and the priestly power; a conflict dating from an age considerably before the appearance of our Redeemer in this world. It was waged by Agamemnon with the seers of Aulis; it cost him the life of his daughter, and prevented the sailing of the Greeks for Troy." Bismarck bade his hearers also remember that in a struggle such as that in which they were engaged, the last of the Hohenstaufens had perished under the axe of a French conqueror in league with the Pope of that day. If, by these allusions, a word of warning was intended to the illustrious House of Hohenzollern, the Chancellor was certainly intelligible enough. But he ventured to speak still more plainly: "We ourselves were by no means far from being in an analogous position; had the French plan of invasion, the outbreak of which was simultaneous with the publication of the Vatican decrees, been crowned with success, there is no knowing what history might not have had to record of the *Gesta Dei per Francos* in Germany." Bismarck must have been more than ordinarily anxious to inspire his Imperial master with fear and horror of the Catholic Church, otherwise he would scarcely have allowed himself to give expression to surmises so repugnant to good taste. His admirers, however, pronounced this speech to be "one of the best and most significant" which he had ever made. The majority in the Upper House proved as favourable to the Government as that in the Lower. The revision of the Constitution was decided upon by eighty-seven votes against fifty-three. More than half of the members had abstained from taking any part in the deliberations.

The way to the promulgation of the new laws was now clear, and the Government had reason to be entirely satisfied with the zeal of their party. Their satisfaction was even greater at the rapidity with which the Church Laws were voted and passed.

The deliberations in the Chamber had begun on the 7th of March; by the 20th the work was accomplished. So hurried were the proceedings that the members of the Centre had with difficulty secured freedom of speech. As Mallinkradt said, "The minority was simply trampled under foot." A counter-part to that which occurred at Berlin on the 8th of March, 1873, will scarcely be found in the parliamentary annals of any Constitutional Government—namely, that the minority obtained a hearing only by the threat of insisting upon *personal* voting at *each* paragraph, if the majority should persist in proceeding so inconsiderately with the debate. "We demand," said Mallinkradt, "to be allowed first to discuss, and then to vote."

The *training* of the clergy in Prussia was in no way distinguished from that of the other learned professions. Ecclesiastical students, in common with those of law, medicine, and philology, were bound to pass the "final" examination at a Prussian gymnasium. Of ecclesiastical institutions in which the future clergy could pursue their studies, there were none in Prussia. At Gaesdonck (Diocese of Münster) there was, it is true, under the direction of the bishops, the Collegium Augustinianum, as a substitute for the gymnasium, but by no means intended exclusively for theological students. At Pelpin (Diocese of Kulm) there was also the Collegium Marianum, as a substitute for the lower gymnasiums. Otherwise, ecclesiastical students frequented without exception the public gymnasiums. In some few towns were to be found boarding schools, where boys were received at a trifling expense, and where they had the advantage of studying under regular clerical supervision. Both these institutions were just those which were regarded with special dislike by the Minister and by the Liberals. It was in vain for Catholic deputies to appeal to the fact that the most satisfactory results had been obtained from the pupils of these institutions; Mallinkradt furnished the Ministry with the special reports of the Government inspectors to that effect. The facts were such as Falk could not deny; he did not hesitate, therefore, to explain, through his commissioner, that his real motive for suppressing these institutions was on account "of their involving the question of education; the question whether the youths destined to the priesthood were to be trained as their religious superior wished." The suppression of these institutions, which was

decided upon at the request of the Minister, was nothing less than an encroachment upon the right of the Church to educate her priesthood, and also an attack upon her inner life and organization. This the Liberals knew full well. "We can by no means allow," said they, "that innocent boys, in the freshness of youth, should have their spirits broken by the discipline of a monastery, and be denied the right of deciding upon their own future."

Theological training, properly so called, was supplied to ecclesiastical students either at one of the universities dependent on the State, or by means of faculties, founded by those bishops to whom the right appertained, for the study of philosophy and theology. The unsatisfactory results experienced by the bishops with regard to the Universities of Bonn and Breslau made it very undesirable that they should be frequented by young theological students. Falk, however, on his part, was bent on preventing their studying at the institutions under episcopal control; he applied, then, for the right, which he obtained, of visiting these institutions, of laying down their plan of instruction, and of closing them at pleasure. The probable result of the theological course at the State universities may be guessed by the declaration of Falk: "The Government will not be prepared to depose professors of Catholic theology because their doctrine may not be quite in accordance with that of the bishop." The orthodoxy of the teacher as well as of the scholar was, therefore, to be at the disposition of the Protestant Minister of Public Worship!

In order to keep the matter of theological training firmly in hand, candidates were required to pass a special examination "as to fitness for their vocation by general knowledge, especially in the regions of philosophy, history, and German literature." As a matter of fact, there was no real ground for treating students in theology differently from students in law or medicine. As a proof of the zeal with which ecclesiastics pursued non-theological studies there was the fact, of which the Minister was aware, that a large proportion of the prize essays, both in philosophy and history, were annually carried off by Catholic theological students. Moreover, the bishops had always required of candidates for holy orders, especially in the first year of their academical course, special attention to philosophy, history, and physical science. As far back as the year 1863 an enactment of the Archbishop of Cologne was communicated to the theological students at Bonn, charging them to pursue those studies with ardour, "in order to lay the foundations of a solid and scientific education, so necessary to the priestly office, especially in these days." Falk was aware of this,



but his great aim was to infuse into the studies of ecclesiastics the spirit of "nationalism;" hence, his insisting on their examination by a State commissioner, in order to determine whether or no they were "national,"—that is to say, whether their minds had been formed according to the spirit of Prussian Protestantism. Reichensperger said with justice, "that it would be indeed a scandal to leave to the decision of the State the question who should be admitted and who should be rejected from the priesthood."

In order to take away the last remnant of the Church's independence, the right of protest against all ecclesiastical appointments, including provisional "supplies," was to be adjudged to the State. The bishop was to be compelled to yield to the protest of the Chief President, unless, indeed, the "Ecclesiastical Court of Justice" had pronounced against the said protest. Reichensperger exclaimed, in angry derision: "Why did not the Roman emperors decree that no ecclesiastical office was to be discharged without the consent of the Proconsul? This would have been an easy method of hindering the growth and activity of the Church, and of trampling her under foot." By Windthorst this act of legislation was described as "an unprecedented usurpation by the State of the mission given by Christ to His Apostles." The Government attempted to justify its pretensions by the announcement that, "since the Vatican Council, the State had to deal no longer with the Catholic Church and an independent episcopate, inasmuch as all power was handed over exclusively to the Pope, now pronounced infallible."

This idea was not a new one; it had already been expressed by Bismarck, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, in his circular despatch of May the 14th, 1872. His object was to incite the Governments of Europe to an entire change of policy in the event of a fresh election to the chair of St. Peter. With the astonishing hardihood so characteristic of himself when on the territory of religion, Bismarck had affirmed, "the Pope has now virtually stepped into the place of every individual bishop; the bishops are now nothing more than his instruments and functionaries, having no responsibility of their own. In their relation to Governments they have become officers of a foreign potentate, and of a potentate who, by virtue of his infallibility, is more absolute than the most absolute monarch in the world." The speech of the Chancellor was met by a reply of well-merited severity. In January, 1875, the German bishops issued a collective Declaration, in which they complained of the way in which the Chancellor of the Empire had held forth upon Catholic dogmas in the ears of Protestants, and of Catholics who had

left the Church. Proceeding to give the true explanation of the dogma of Papal infallibility, and with unmistakable reference to recent events, the bishops continued: "The Catholic Church can, with no shadow of justice, be charged with the immoral and despotic principle that submission to the Head releases the members from individual responsibility."

This assumed dread of an overbearing Papacy was a weapon of no small service to Bismarck in the object he had in view. He insisted repeatedly that his quarrel was not with the Church, but with the "party fighting for the temporal dominion of the priesthood." This was the pretext for depriving the bishops of their right of free appointment to benefices. From the very establishment of the Prussian Constitution an agreement had been made between the Government and the bishops, whereby the rights of patronage had been determined. In instances where the Government could prove an historically authenticated claim to the appointment of priests to certain benefices, the bishop was bound, provided no canonical impediment existed, to appoint the candidate proposed by the Government. This claim extended to some 500 benefices in the kingdom; all others were "*liberæ collationis episcopalis*."

The proposed new law, however, assigned to the Government the right of veto upon every clerical appointment whatsoever, even provisional ones, as also the right of resisting the desire of the bishop. The appointment of a priest to any charge whatever, without the previous consent of the Administration, was punishable by a heavy fine. If a priest, without permission from the Chief President, were to exercise any function, even the administration of the last Sacraments, he became liable to a fine of 300 marks: in the case of a bishop it was to extend to 3000. There is no denying that by the new law a skilful plan was laid for ensnaring the Church. The education of her priesthood was to be under the surveillance of Protestant functionaries, and the appointment of her clergy to be regulated by non-Catholic Ministers. Even from the Liberal ranks some voices were raised to protest that "in spite of the dread of Ultramontanism, measures so arbitrary could not be sanctioned." This was, however, but the generous outburst of the moment; in the end, the Liberals fell in with every measure for destroying the Church's freedom.

A special law "concerning ecclesiastical discipline" was to secure to every priest unauthorized by the bishop the protection of the Government. By the terms of this law, moreover, the Pope could no longer exercise any ordinary jurisdiction in Germany, inasmuch as the right of enforcing discipline was to be in the hands of "German ecclesiastical magistrates" only.

These were bound to report every infringement of rule, the result being either a fine of upwards of 90 marks, or detention in a "house of correction" for upwards of fourteen days. Priests were to have the right of appeal to the State against the decisions of the bishop; and, with the view of compelling the Church to bend completely to State supremacy, the Government was to have the same privilege of appeal to "the Royal Court of Justice for Ecclesiastical Affairs." - In no place and at no time had the Church allowed to her ministers the "*recursus tamquam ab abuso*" to secular judges. Pius IX. had specially, through the Constitution *Apostolicæ Sedis* of October 12, 1869, threatened with the major excommunication all "*impedientes directe vel indirecte exercitium jurisdictionis ecclesiasticæ sive interni sive externi fori et ad hoc recurrentes ad forum sæculare ejusque mandata procurantes.*" The new law gave therefore to the secular power a prerogative which ecclesiastical law forbade the clergy to respect; consequently the reproach of Mallinkrath was no unjust one when he said that "no one could venture to deny that the clergy were systematically encouraged in opposition and disobedience to ecclesiastical authority."

But the Government had yet harder measures in store. Whilst the episcopal right of enforcing discipline was to be confined to the narrowest possible limits, the State was to have the power of dismissing any priest "whose continuance in the exercise of his office should be found irreconcilable with the public regulations." Every exercise of his office on the part of a deposed priest was punishable by a fine of 3000 marks.

The Court of Justice, to be established for the express purpose of dealing with cases of this kind, was to consist of eleven members, of whom the president and five others were to belong to the judicature. The Government professed its intention to summon also to this Court "*ecclesiastics of eminence.*" Subsequently, Protestant ministers who were taking part in proceedings against Catholic bishops, were numbered amongst its members. The prerogatives of the Court were almost unheard-of; it was empowered "to exact every information tending to elucidate the matter in hand;" and it was to give its decisions "according to its own conviction, without being bound by the rules of positive evidence." The president could, whenever it so pleased him, institute domiciliary visits, and interfere in matters of personal freedom, even as regarded letters and other private papers. Windthorst might well exclaim in reference to it: "This Court is endowed with prerogatives unequalled by *any other in the world*; and I do not hesitate to predict that soon we shall have a regular tribunal of the Inquisition established in the land."

Practically, the Church was indifferent to the proposed dealings of this most arbitrary tribunal, inasmuch as she could not possibly relinquish her rights, nor bend to the decisions of a secular court. "Do these gentlemen seriously imagine," said Windthorst again, "that the Church can be obedient to legislation of this kind? They might as well ask her to sign her own death-warrant! Men may despoil the Catholic Church in Prussia, persecute her, and trample her under foot; but compel her to commit suicide they never will!" The Government and the various Protestant parties, however, would brook no interference; their hopes were built upon the power of the State, that power which had conquered Austria, and crushed France. Was it likely, they boasted, that this power would yield to a band of refractory and arrogant priests?

The third law, "concerning the limits of the right to enforce ecclesiastical discipline and correction," was intended to afford the means of carrying the other laws out. By it the Church was to be prevented from enforcing ecclesiastical penalties upon disobedient members; in no instance were such to be decreed in matters "concerning the laws of the State, or regulations of the temporal power." Even the threat of ecclesiastical censure was strictly forbidden when occasion might thereby be given for "a fault of omission with regard to the State."

That this paragraph would subsequently entail the punishment of a heavy fine or imprisonment upon refusal to give absolution, scarcely struck its promoters at this stage of the proceedings. Such, however, was the case; a fact which, perhaps, more vividly than any other, illustrates the spirit of the entire legislation.

On the 9th of May, 1873, the debates were concluded and the laws approved in both Houses of the Diet; the sanction of the King was immediately given, and publication followed on the 15th of May. Loud expressions of rejoicing sounded from the Liberal ranks, and were echoed, though somewhat more faintly, by the Protestant Conservatives. The individual of all others who had cause for joy was, undoubtedly, Bismarck, whose hard and despotic nature must have felt itself satisfied. All the more forcible, by way of contrast, was the speech of Count Landsberg in the Upper House: "Do you remember, gentlemen, in whose hands was placed the welfare of the State at the time when Christians were compelled to take refuge in the Catacombs? In the hands of such men as Nero and Domitian. And this was no mere chance coincidence; for be assured, that when Christians are forced to fly to the Catacombs for shelter, nothing but tyranny and despotism can be in power." Count Landsberg proceeded to point out the true and real

motives of the conflict with the Church. The Chancellor had none but himself to thank for the satire with which he was overwhelmed in the words which follow: "The origin of this attack has been hidden under the legends of the Trojan War; but in reality it does not date from the time of the lying and political hypocrite, Calchas, but from that moment when the father of lies first made his appearance in this world, and man ventured to set himself up against the authority of God. Of this can truly be said '*natura mortalium imperii avida*;' and, looking around me now, I think I may quote the further words of the classic '*et præceps ad explendam cupidinem animi*.'" On the last day of the debate Baron Schorlemer also spoke in terms which did not spare his opponents. Alluding to a former expression of the Chancellor's with reference to the Liberals, that there were "too many Catilines" in Prussia, he continued, "I have not the least doubt that *we* are now numbered amongst the Catilines as enemies of the State; but let me say that, in my opinion, there is one special Catiline amongst us by whom the peace of the Fatherland is threatened." After this Bismarck certainly could not affirm that the Catholic Opposition had bent before him, or had given the slightest evidence of fear.

The laws were now ready; "the weapons are forged," said Mallinkrath, "and the Government can now begin its labours." The proceedings throughout had been characterised by an overbearing assurance, and no one doubted that the Ministers intended setting to work with rapidity and decision. One obstacle, however, lay in their path, disposed though they might be to ignore it—namely, the resistance of the Episcopate.

As far back as the 30th of January, the bishops had made a formal declaration to the Ministry that "the laws now under discussion were irreconcilable with the duties binding upon every bishop, and opposed to the conscience of each individual Catholic." What, then, would be the next step to be taken, supposing the Prussian Episcopate to refuse all co-operation in carrying out the laws? The last words addressed to the majority in the House by Catholic lips were those of Schorlemer: "Accept, then, if you are bent upon it, this new legislation; decree, if you will, this Draco-like Code; but of this I am very certain, you will never see it carried into effect, for we shall never yield." Falk affected to question this assurance; but at the same time he was obliged to ask himself what should be his next course of action, supposing the prediction of Baron Schorlemer to be fulfilled? This question expressed in the clearest manner the mistake into which the Protestant officials had allowed themselves, with their usual superciliousness, to be led by a few anti-Catholic professors.

The ancient rulers of Prussia, ever since the middle of the seventeenth century, had clung to the idea that they were "Chief Bishops," even over their Catholic subjects. It was considered an act of peculiar indulgence on the part of the Elector Frederick William, when, in 1674, he allowed the Catholic clergy at Cleves, "in causis fidei necnon in spiritualibus et sacramentalibus" to accept a foreign ecclesiastic as their *Ordinari*us. Under this Elector, as well as under his successors in the monarchy, the attempt was repeatedly made to find some ecclesiastic in the land to whom the ruler might delegate his "episcopal" rights. At each of these attempts special stress was laid upon the declaration that "neither 'Romano Pontifici,' nor 'Episcopo,' nor 'Metropolitano,' nor to any other individual would the least right be conceded." These efforts were all in vain, inasmuch as, in order to administer the Sacrament of Holy Orders, the Vicar-General of the kingdom must of necessity have been raised to the episcopal dignity, which could not be done without the Pope. The attempt to control the affairs of the Catholic Church by means of a "Central Office" at Berlin was still persevered in. In those districts of Prussia which had formerly belonged to Poland the rulers of the House of Brandenburg acted as absolute masters; allowing to the priests, it is true, the ordering of the "cultus internus," but granting to no bishop the "jura episcopalia." At that time the number of Catholics in Prussia was too small to enable them to resist this encroachment of the State. Moreover, the life of the Church was then so undeveloped in that country that the clergy themselves even were unconscious of their abnormal position. In the Catholic provinces afterwards annexed to Prussia the spirit of the Church was almost extinct. Consequently, upon the new regulation of ecclesiastical affairs in Prussia, in 1820, several matters concerning the Catholic Church were left in a condition which, when duly considered, was found to be an unlawful limitation of her rights. Meanwhile, a new population had grown up. Many circumstances had combined to fan the flame of genuine and fervent Christianity, which had seemed nearly extinct under the ashes of indifferentism; so that all at once—her enemies scarcely knew how—the Church arose glorious and triumphant. Scarcely had the restoration of political freedom in 1848 been joyfully welcomed, when the German Episcopate assembled at Würzburg, to lay down the principles of ecclesiastical liberty. The new Constitution of Prussia had restored to the bishops the right of regulating and administering the affairs of the Church, and they entered upon their task with an energy and ability almost surprising, considering that the field of labour was a new one. Few examples are to be found in the Church's history of



growth so rapid, so vigorous, and at the same time so healthy, as was manifested by her in Prussia during the thirty years from 1840 to 1870. It seems as if Almighty God had showered down upon her then a superabundance of blessings in order to strengthen her for the persecution which was to come in 1870. It was a time of preparation for the final struggle of Protestantism against the Church; that struggle which, in the prophetic words of Cardinal Wiseman, is to be fought out in the arid Mark of Brandenburg.

In all this the statesmen of Prussia saw nothing but the results of the Roman propaganda, and accused the Government of Frederick William IV. of criminal connivance with the "increasing arrogance of the Roman priesthood." They looked back with regretful eyes to the time of absolute State supremacy in Prussia; nothing, therefore, was more natural than that they should listen to Protestant and Old-Catholic lawyers when, after the Vatican Council, they asserted that there needed but a few bold and decisive measures to make the bishops compliant vassals of the all-powerful State. In the devotion of the Catholic clergy to their faith and principles, in the fidelity of the people to their pastors and their faith, the statesmen of Prussia believed not one whit. Dollinger had talked of the "thousands of clergy" who, like himself, were ready to fall away from the Pope as soon as they should be assured of the protection of the Government. And so Bismarck allowed himself to be beguiled into the imagination that the bishops, clergy, and Catholic people would, after a short contest, submit to the laws which were to make the Roman Church the slave of a Protestant State. The possibility of being met by persistent resistance never occurred to the Chancellor; therefore he did not so much as ask himself the question whether these new laws were in opposition to the doctrines and constitution of the Church; and herein he certainly showed a want of political wisdom and discretion, never more requisite than when dealing with questions of religious organization. When, therefore, the bishops, clergy, and Catholic people rose as one man in behalf of their faith, the position of Bismarck became a very critical one, and he was reduced to adopt measures to which he was driven, as it were, by the embarrassment of the moment. Hence, the peculiar character of animosity and arbitrariness which distinguished them. That he would shrink back, intimidated, no one for an instant supposed. Men of Prince Bismarck's stamp, of iron will and unrestrained love of dominion, know not how to give in or draw back, even when principle is concerned. Painful as is the contemplation of such a position, there is comfort in

the certainty that, if we but wait patiently, we shall witness the defeat of these Titanic minds. For how lofty soever be their intellectual edifices, they are built upon the shifting sand, and of such the Lord Himself said, "Et ruina ejus erit magna nimis."

Before the promulgation of the new laws in May, 1873, the bishops of Prussia, assembled at the tomb of St. Boniface at Fulda, issued a Pastoral Letter to the faithful of all the dioceses. They declared the aim and object of the proposed legislation to be, "the separation of the bishops from the visible head of the Church; the alienation of the clergy and people from their lawful pastors; the severance of the faithful in Prussia from the universal Church of the Incarnate God and Redeemer of the world; and the utter destruction of the Divine organization of the Church." At the same time they expressed their joy at the countless proofs of fidelity and devotion given both by priests and people; "this," they continued, "is our only consolation in the afflictions of the present time, and our ground of hope in the tribulations which threaten us." With a deep sense of their apostolical dignity, they added: "Mindful of the word spoken by the Holy Ghost Himself to the bishops, bidding them feed the Church of God which Christ hath purchased with His own blood, and remembering also our obligation to execute this commission of the Holy Ghost, we are resolved, as regards the government and constitution of the Church, to consent to nothing which shall be opposed to the precepts of the Catholic faith and the rights committed to us by God."

In these words was contained a last warning to the Prussian Government, bidding it refrain from the contest, or be prepared for the determined resistance of the Church. Upon the dismissal of the Diet, on the 20th of May, the President, Count Roon, declared that, "His Majesty's Government was most anxious that these laws should tend to promote peace amongst the members of the various religious denominations, and induce the Church to devote her energies more exclusively to the simple preaching of the word of God." Sentiments of a like nature were echoed by the *Provinzial Correspondenz*: "The Government confidently hopes that the Catholic bishops will by the spirit of their admonitions to their clergy induce them to conform to the principles and conditions laid down by these laws, and hereby secure to themselves a wider and more effective field of action." The Ministers trusted "to the conscientiousness as well as the prudence of the chief pastors of the Catholic Church to prevent a breach with the State."

It was a curious illustration of the peaceful intentions upon which the Ministers were so fond of insisting, that, on the

20th of May itself, a fresh blow was aimed at the Church's existence. The Chancellor pronounced the "*Congregatio Sacerdotum sub titulo Sanctissimi Redemptoris*," the Congregation of the Lazarists, the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and the "*Société du Sacré Cœur de Jésus*," to be "affiliated to" the Jesuits, and decreed their dissolution within six months at the latest.

In the meantime the bishops, after deliberation at Fulda, had come to the irrevocable decision that the new laws were irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church. In their earnest desire for peace, they had considered carefully whether it might be possible to accept *some* of the conditions proposed; they were forced to decide in the negative, inasmuch as they could not and might not recognise "the competence of the State to dispose of the affairs of the Church." On the 26th of May, they presented to the Ministry an Address, in which they declared without reservation that the laws in question were "an assault upon the liberties and rights bestowed upon the Church by the ordinance of God." "The Church," they continued, "cannot recognise or allow the Pagan principle that the State is the source of all power, and that the Church has a claim to those rights only which are conceded her by the State. A concession such as this would be a denial of the Godhead of Christ and of the divinity of His doctrines and institutions; it would be to make Christianity itself dependent upon the arbitrary will and pleasure of man." In this protest the Government saw "a fresh proof of Ultramontane arrogance," to which it was determined not to yield. In effect, however, in spite of all its efforts, the design of the laws could not be carried out without the co-operation of the bishops. Neither the amicable dispositions manifested by Bismarck towards Italy, nor his displeasure at the Presidentship of MacMahon, brought him any nearer to the realization of his hopes. The zeal with which the election of the Old-Catholic Bishop, at the beginning of June, was greeted at Berlin did not long escape even Protestant derision; whilst Bismarck's announcement that, upon the choice of a successor to Pius IX., he should institute inquiries as to the validity of the election, met with nothing but ridicule.

On the other hand, Catholics in every district took every opportunity of expressing at public meetings "their true and unswerving fidelity to their divinely-appointed overseers, the bishops, and to the Pope, the supreme ruler of the Church;" neither were they behindhand in proving to the Government that mere temporal force is of little avail against a people devoted to its religion.

Martin, Bishop of Paderborn, was the first to offer definite resistance to Government measures, by refusing to submit the seminaries of his diocese to the revision of the State. The consequences of such a refusal were well known to the noble-hearted prelate; the divine rights of the Church, however, were of more importance in his eyes than temporal advantages purchased by an unlawful concession. A fortnight later, his seminaries were deprived, by the Chief President, of State recognition and support. Melchers, Archbishop of Cologne, was simultaneously impeached for excommunicating two Old-Catholic professors. The Minister of Public Worship next took upon himself to instruct Förster, Prince-Bishop of Breslau; he required that one of the canons of the cathedral, expelled by the bishop, should be admitted to the deliberations of the Chapter, and retain his right to a voice in the future election of a bishop. The contempt with which this assumption on the part of a Protestant Minister was regarded by Catholics generally might have convinced the Government that the knowledge of the Church's doctrine and discipline had taken deep root in the minds and hearts of the people. Proof of this was in no way diminished by an attempt on the part of the Duke of Ratibor, who, in an address to the Emperor, alleged that in the Catholic Church itself were many friends of the new legislation. The statement was, naturally, gratifying to the Emperor; a week later, however, the Silesian Knights of Malta showed their appreciation of the Duke of Ratibor's attempt, by deposing him from his office as head of their Order.

Meanwhile the bishops continued to exercise their prerogative of appointment to clerical vacancies, regardless of the State decrees and of the penalties accompanying their infraction. Foremost amongst them was Count Ledochowski, Archbishop of Posen, who, at the beginning of August, had strenuously resisted the claim of the State officials to reorganize his ecclesiastical seminary. On the 24th of October, Falk found it necessary to issue injunctions to these magistrates, bidding them increase their vigilance with regard to "illegal" clerical appointments; "the more so, as the number of offenders was found to be increasing, and it was becoming necessary to proceed against them with greater severity than before." It was made compulsory on the magistrates to report "*every single exercise of office* on the part of one of such illegally-appointed priests; they were to be pursued by fresh pains and penalties until they should give in their submission to the laws." The officials did their best. By the autumn of 1873 the indictments were so numerous that the Law Courts had more work upon their hands than they cared for. The Government was evidently

in earnest in the proclamation that, "if necessary, they would resort to the severest measures in order either to bend or to break the arrogance of Rome upon Prussian soil." The question was, whether the Government would be in a position to do so. The penalty of fines, for instance, must necessarily cease when, as actually happened, the clergy were incapable of paying them. The fines imposed upon the Bishop of Treves amounted before long to 20,000 marks; the Archbishop of Posen was condemned to pay 60,000. Falk desired that imprisonment should be resorted to, and the clergy went to prison with a smile upon their lips, whilst their flocks redoubled in devotion to priests who feared not suffering in behalf of the Church.

On the 7th of August Pope Pius IX. had sent an autograph letter to the Emperor William, pointing out to him that the approval of measures so unconstitutional as those of his Government in the affairs of the Church would prove subversive to his own Imperial throne. Then followed the sentence so unwelcome to the ears of a Prussian Protestant, and, in particular, to the "Protector" of the Evangelical Church: "*Parlo con franchezza, giacche la verita è la mia bandiera, e parlo per esaurire un mio dovere il quale m'impone di dire a tutti il vero, e anche a chi non è Cattolico, giacche chiunque è battezzato appartiene in qualche parte, e in qualche modo, che non è qui luogo a spiegare, appartiene, dissì, al Papa.*" To a Catholic even ordinarily well-instructed in his faith this was quite comprehensible. The Emperor protested against it, however, with a vehemence which, from his point of view, was natural enough, adding the assurance that "he was fully aware of his own responsibility to God as a Christian monarch." Then followed the accusation: "Many of the clergy in Prussia, subject to your Holiness, deny the obligation of obedience to the secular power." The Emperor further gave expression to the hope that "the Pope would make use of his authority to put an end to an agitation originating from a misapprehension of the truth, and from an abuse of sacerdotal power." Here let us remark that it might have been remembered that, before the promulgation of the new laws, the authority of the Pope had been ignored and, by the laws in question, specially attacked. With reference to the claim made by the Holy Father to the allegiance of every baptized Christian, the Emperor thought fit to add: "The Evangelical faith which, as is well known to your Holiness, I profess in common with my ancestors, and the greater part of my subjects, recognises no other Mediator between God and man but our Lord Jesus Christ." This profession had, in reality, no bearing upon the

argument of the Pope. The Catholic Church herself recognises no other Mediator except Jesus Christ, but she acknowledges and honours the Pope as the visible representative on earth of that Mediator. The reply of the Emperor was looked upon by the Protestants of the land as "a well-merited rebuke of Papal presumption," as well as a defence of the common interests of Evangelical Christianity; the Government, in publishing the correspondence, had probably foreseen this result. But the Ministers were greatly mistaken in anticipating a similar impression upon Catholics. Before the elections to the Diet, in the middle of October, the Minister of the Interior caused bales on bales of copies of the correspondence to be distributed, especially in the Rhine Provinces, in the hope of rousing party feeling against the Pope. The letter of the Holy Father was, however, quite in accordance with the minds of his Catholic subjects, who merely regretted the useless expenditure of money incurred by the Government in the circulation of the papers. The new elections increased the Centre party from 52 to 89 members: another proof that the Catholics of the land had not merely read, but appreciated the correspondence between the Emperor and the Pope.

The Government next attempted, but with no better success, to prove, from several pastoral letters of the French bishops, "an alliance of French and German Ultramontanists hostile to the State." Why, indeed, asked the Catholics of Prussia, should they be forbidden to receive expressions of sympathy from their brethren in other lands, when the resolutions of Protestant meetings in England and Scotland were accepted with pleasure in the highest circles of the Ministry? No one could assert that Mgr. Freppel, of Angers, or Mgr. Plantier, of Nîmes, had spoken with greater severity than Earl Russell or Sir John Murray, in Exeter Hall. It was, indeed, a special satisfaction to the German bishops to receive, as they did, expressions of approval and veneration from nearly every country in Christendom. England contributed, also, her share of Catholic sympathy. A meeting, presided over by the Duke of Norfolk, on the 6th of February, 1874, and attended by the most influential Catholics of the land, passed the resolution: "That the new ecclesiastical laws in Germany make it impossible for the Church to exercise in freedom her spiritual functions, and are contrary to the rights of conscience." The Pope, in like manner, in his famous Encyclical of the 21st of November, 1873, had declared: "*Novæ leges eo pertinent, ne ecclesia amplius possit existere.*"

Pius IX. rejoiced to be able to hold up as an example to the whole world the "invincible constancy" of the Catholics of Ger-



many, whom "neither affliction, nor oppression, nor imprisonment could induce to render obedience to laws which were contrary to the commandments of God." With the sense of having been wounded in the most sacred feelings of his paternal heart, the venerable Pope complained: "That he had been requested to use his authority to compel the bishops and the faithful to yield obedience to laws unjust and godless in the extreme; to do so would be with his own hand to persecute and scatter the flock of Christ." The Pope consoled his children by calling to their remembrance the words of an ancient doctor of the Church: "Quot tyranni ecclesiam opprimere tentaverunt! Ubinam sunt hostes illi? Silentio et oblivioni traditi sunt. Ubinam ecclesia? Plusquam sol splendescit."

What was now to be the next move on the part of the Government of Prussia? Towards the middle of August, 1873, an assembly of Protestant jurists, at Cassel, had demonstrated that the emoluments attached to ecclesiastical benefices and institutions "were so attached on condition only of obedience to State regulations; in the event of disobedience they could be withheld." All who were aware of the amicable relations of these gentlemen with the Minister of Public Worship knew well enough that their resolutions were indications of a coming storm. Accordingly, on the 19th of September, the Archbishop of Posen was deprived of the temporalities of his See, and three months later a similar sentence was passed on the Bishop of Paderborn. On the other hand, Reinkens, the Old-Catholic Bishop, who had been specially excommunicated by the Pope, was endowed with an annual income of 48,000 marks. Further, on the 22nd of November notice was given to the Archbishop of Posen that the Ministry were unanimous in deciding to carry out in his regard the law of the 12th of May. Ledochowski was required, therefore, to give up his archiepiscopal office, "inasmuch as his continuance therein had become irreconcilable with public regulations." It must have been mortifying to a Government which considered itself the most powerful in the world to be refused obedience by a simple ecclesiastic. "I venture to affirm," wrote the Archbishop, "that by this time the Government of Prussia knows me sufficiently well to be assured that I should esteem it a shame and a disgrace were I voluntarily to abandon my flock in the hour of danger, and allow it to become the prey of infidelity, heresy, and schism."

As a consequence of this refusal, proceedings for the deposition of the Archbishop by the State were forthwith entered upon. Being, moreover, no longer in a position to pay the fines he had already incurred, he was, on the 3rd of February,

1874, consigned to the prison at Ostrowo. The Bishop of Treves had preceded him there at the beginning of March, on the 27th of June the Suffragan Bishop, Janiszewski, and on the 6th of August the Bishop of Paderborn, shared the same fate. How long their punishments were to last was not stated, for fresh accusations, entailing yet severer treatment, were constantly being made. The penalties imposed upon parish-priests accumulated in like manner, and at the beginning of the year 1874, a number of Catholic parishes were deprived of their pastors.

The responsibility for this state of spiritual destitution was laid by the Government upon "the haughty princes and rebellious clergy of the Church, who had recklessly brought this calamity upon their flocks." It was scarcely wise to hazard an accusation of this kind. For some time the ill-sounding phrase of "Prussian craft and Prussian lying" had gone from mouth to mouth, and had been spoken loud enough to reach the ear of the Government. Falk complained to the assembled Diet that so violently had the susceptibilities of Catholics been aroused, that the word of the Government was no longer believed. The position was, in fact, aptly described by Schorlemer, in words spoken at a later period: "The measures of the State threw a dark shadow upon the relations between Catholics and their Sovereign. In Silesia, and within the last ten years in the Rhine Provinces and Westphalia also, there had grown up feelings of esteem and affection for the Royal House of Hohenzollern. All was changed by the legislation and harsh measures of 1873." Perhaps no charge aroused more indignation than the foolish accusation of "rebellion" of the bishops; a charge, however, which the Emperor seemed to confirm in his letter in reply to Lord Russell. The sheep knew their shepherds, and believed their words when, after the imprisonment of Archbishop Ledochowski, they declared: "We are no 'rebels'; the 'haughty princes' of the Church exist in the imagination only of those who have so called us. We have ever taught, and with our last breath shall continue to teach, that we are bound by the law of God to yield submission and obedience to existing authority, as well as love and fidelity to our country. But the same God who imposes on us the duties of obedience and fidelity to our King and country commands us to do nothing—no, not even by a tacit consent—which shall be opposed to His eternal laws, and to the doctrines of Jesus Christ and His Church. The new ecclesiastico-political laws are destructive, in matters of vital importance, to the divinely-appointed constitution and divinely-revealed doctrines of the Catholic Church." Convinced as

they were of the truth of this profession, Catholics took every opportunity of showing their attachment to their pastors. Men of every rank and condition went in hundreds and thousands to the episcopal residences to give personal demonstration of their zeal for the Church. These pilgrimages, reminding one of the best days of the ages of faith, were naturally displeasing in the extreme to the Protestant officials, and gladly would they have checked the applauding multitudes who attended the bishops at every step. Prudence and reason alike urged the Government even now to acknowledge its mistake and change its policy. But, with the rulers of the moment, passion has always predominated over reason, and rather than go back, Prince Bismarck preferred to supplement the injustice begun by measures still more unjust and arbitrary.

The bishops, clergy, and people perceived the fresh misery impending: they trembled, indeed, at the approach of the storm, but their courage and resolution never failed. "Even if, which God forbid, the Church, once so flourishing in our beloved dioceses, should be doomed to persecution and destruction, better far that this should come to pass at the hands of enemies and strangers, whilst we witness to the faith with our goods and our lives, than that we ourselves, as men would have us, should help to ruin and destroy the Church of God." Thus spoke the bishops, and their words found an echo in the hearts of the faithful. Meanwhile, the Archbishop of Posen was being proceeded against in the Court for the Regulation of Ecclesiastical Affairs, and little doubt was entertained that the sentence would be in accordance with the wishes of the Ministry. Then, it was felt, would come the turn of the rest of the Episcopate. Not content with what had already been done, the Government now made the fresh charge, that "the bishops, in spite of their deposition by the State, continued to exercise their episcopal functions, and the people to persist in regarding them as their lawful pastors." What, then, were the means to be adopted to prevent this "illegal" discharge of spiritual functions? They were found in the Penal Statutes of France and Spain, according to which ecclesiastics found guilty of determined resistance to State decrees were to be coerced by the threat of banishment. The Diet was now petitioned to enact a similar law for the German empire, and on the 30th of April, 1874, the Bill was proposed for discussion. The Government of each separate State was to have the right of banishing "refractory" ecclesiastics from specified districts of the province, or from the German empire altogether. That by a law of this nature all personal freedom was annihilated seemed to be ignored by the Ministers, who expressed the opinion that "a

*sharp* remedy was now required; a wound made by a sharp knife was more easily healed than one caused by a blunt instrument." "True," retorted Windthorst, "it is a sharp remedy indeed which you are proposing; the weapon of a despotism almost effete, but which flourished at the time of the Jacobins in France."

The speakers of the Centre appealed in vain to the sense of honour and love of freedom of their fellow-members in the Diet. Reichensperger went so far as to say that one step higher in the scale of punishments would terminate in the guillotine. All, however, was of no avail. Men who in other cases would have vindicated the rights of personal and civic freedom, now stifled every better impulse through hatred of the Church. "The Government *must* conquer; the Clergy *must* yield; there will be no lasting peace without the complete subjection of the clergy." Such was their cry. These gentlemen would, probably, have accepted the erection of the guillotine, and have considered it, with the Prince de Polignac at a period of like tyranny in France, "*une loi d'amour et de conciliation.*"

Bismarck had his will, and the law was passed. By its provisions, priests deposed from their offices by the State were liable to banishment from specified places, or from the German empire altogether. The Government was to have the right also of interneging such priests at pleasure in any particular locality. The law was to be enforced against those who had exercised ecclesiastical functions contrary to State regulations, and after having incurred legal penalties for so doing. Moreover, the Government made it permissible to eject priests from their place of residence as soon as the "process of inquiry," on account of illegal exercise of ecclesiastical functions, should be set on foot against them. As a result of these most arbitrary regulations, priests have been compelled to wander homeless and houseless during more than five years from place to place, merely for having administered the sacrament of baptism, or performed the office of burial of the dead, contrary to the will of the State. In another case, a priest was excluded from his parish for years, during the whole process of inquiry against him, although twice during that interval he was pronounced not guilty. The instances in which the clergy were banished from their parishes for months at a time, by virtue of this law, may be reckoned by hundreds. Then, again, because the Government feared to trust to Catholic officials to carry out these measures, Protestants, or such Catholics as had shown themselves hostile to the Church, were frequently, in the Catholic provinces, intruded into office. Hence, a system of corruption which spread far and wide into the administration, and from which even the courts of justice were not exempt.

An attempt on the part of the Minister of Public Worship to take into his own hands the appointment of priests to those parishes deprived of their pastors by death or banishment, signally failed. By a special law of May 21st, 1874, the Government wished to award the right of nomination to a vacant benefice to the members of a parish, or to the person possessing the right of presentation to a benefice. If within two months the patron should make no use of his privilege, the nomination was to be left to the parish. "If," said Falk, "the people be really and religiously alive to a sense of spiritual destitution, they will gladly avail themselves of this provision." Five years later, however, on giving up his portfolio, the Minister was forced to own that this "religious feeling," according to his view of the matter, did not exist in a single parish. The few priests who, throughout the whole empire, had been found willing to accept benefices from an Old-Catholic patron, lived isolated in their parishes, and were universally despised. Practically, the law died at the moment of its birth; its aim had been to Protestantize the Church; but the Prussian Government was never more at fault than when counting upon the apostasy of the Catholic population. To complete the list of oppressive, though abortive, measures against the Church, must be mentioned the law for the administration of dioceses deprived of their bishops by the State. In the case of the Archbishop of Posen, deposed from his office on the 15th of April, the Government had been obliged to own that its decisions "were ignored by the Cathedral Chapter, which persisted in not recognising the vacancy of the See; it seemed probable, also, that this example would be followed by the majority of the clergy." It was also evident that, in the event of the bishop's death, the Chapter would have no regard to the State regulations in the choice of his successor. The Government therefore determined to take steps for preventing all intercourse with a "deprived" bishop, and for providing the administration of the diocese independently of the Bishop and Chapter, and this purpose was to be served by the law of the 20th of May, 1874, for the administration of Catholic Bishoprics, whereby every exercise of episcopal functions in a diocese vacant through the death or "deprivation" of the bishop was threatened with imprisonment for a term of from six months to two years. The law was applicable, not to acts of jurisdiction alone, but to the administration of the sacraments of confirmation and holy orders, as well as to the consecration of the holy oils. Consequently, the Suffragan Bishop of Posen was sentenced to six months' imprisonment for having consecrated the Holy Oils on Maundy-Thursdays. The clause stating that "ecclesiastical functions thus exercised would be

invalid," sufficiently proves that the authors of the law were utterly ignorant of the life of the Church. For the administration of the revenues of the diocese, the Minister was to appoint a special commissioner to whom the dues of the bishop were to be assigned. During the vacancy of a see, parishes were to have the right of choosing their own pastors, should a vacancy occur. The disposal of the large sums which reverted to the State from episcopal sees was left entirely and unconditionally to the Minister. That the Cathedral Chapter would co-operate with the State in the choice of a bishop was as inconceivable as that a parish should choose its own priest in opposition to the decrees of the Church. The Government was reminded of the regulation of the Council of Trent: "*Sacerdotes qui tantummodo a populo aut seculari potestate ac magistratu vocati et instituti ad sacra ministeria exercenda ascendunt et qui ea propria temeritate sibi sumunt, omnes non ecclesiae ministri sed fures et latrones per ostium non ingressi habendi sunt.*" The decrees of the Council of Trent were, however, of little importance in the eyes of the Prussian Government. Catholics were prepared for this, and as little expected a change of policy on its part as they contemplated the possibility of their own submission to the laws. Their temper of mind was aptly described by Mallinkradt, in the session of the Diet of February 7th, 1874; "Submission to these laws would be the greatest possible misfortune. It is far less prejudicial to the Church to be oppressed by enemies from without, than to let herself be poisoned and infected from within. In the former case, should she for a time be even banished from our country, she will, at the right moment, be ready to return, clad in the white robe of innocence. This she would forfeit were she voluntarily to submit to shame and dishonour."

The literary coadjutors of the Minister of Public Worship had, indeed, imagined that the educated portion of the Catholic population would speedily change its mind, and make common cause with the State. It was surely a disgrace to the mightiest Government in Europe to seek the fulfilment of its own designs through the treachery of Catholics to their Church. Bismarck was playing high, but his hopes and expectations were not to be realised. Disregard of the laws of the State, necessitated, indeed, by the prior obligation of obedience to the laws of God, was tending to destroy alike the prestige of the Government and all confidence in it. "This confidence," remarked Mallinkradt, "has in the Catholic districts of the Empire been so thoroughly shaken that it may be said *no longer to exist.*"

Obedience to the laws of the State in the recent legislation would have exterminated from the hearts of the people the



spirit of devotion to the Church. The Ministers had declared that "the *ecclesiastical* spirit ought to be done away with, whilst the *religious* spirit should remain:" they might and should have known that, for Catholics, the one cannot exist without the other.

In effect, the activity of this Ministry was destructive and pernicious in every direction. History will set its seal of truth to the admonition uttered by Reichensperger on the 5th of February, 1874: "It is my opinion that the present administrators of the power of the State have no intention of changing their course of action. I am convinced, therefore, that the *one* service they can now render to the country is to beg His Majesty to accept their resignation. The Ministers now in office have already thrown down the noblest pillar in our Constitutional edifice—the right of religious liberty. If they would save the country from further confusion and misery, let them resign!"

The Ministry, however, did not resign. The work of devastation and destruction was to proceed still further.



### ART. III.—A PROTESTANT LIFE OF ST. HUGH.

1. *The Life of St. Hugh of Avalon, Bishop of Lincoln, with some Account of his Predecessors in the See of Lincoln.* By GEORGE G. PERRY, M.A., Canon of Lincoln. London: Murray. 1879.
2. *Magna Vita S. Hugonis.* Edited by Rev. J. F. DIMOCK, M.A. London: Longmans. 1860. (Rolls Series.)

A CURIOUS change is taking place in the minds of many Anglicans. When Elizabeth first established her new hierarchy its members little cared to claim descent from the previous occupants of ancient sees. Pilkington, the first Protestant Bishop of Durham, spoke with great contempt and in abusive language of St. Wilfrid, St. William, Lanfranc, St. Anselm, St. Thomas, and St. Edmund.\* Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, considered it a sad but undeniable fact that they had all been drowned in damnable idolatry for eight centuries at least. And the rest expressed similar opinions. Now, on the contrary, Protestant Bishops take every opportunity of proclaiming themselves the legitimate representatives of the ancient ecclesiastical rulers of England. Canon Perry dedicates his

\* "Works," p. 587. Parker Soc. Ed.

Life of St. Hugh, "To the Right Reverend Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln, the successor of St. Hugh, alike in his virtues as in his see." Is this repentance? Is it a turning of the hearts of the children to the fathers? No. The lives of the English saints, which have appeared of late years from the pens of Anglican clergymen, are very different from those which in 1840-45 foretold the issue of the Oxford movement in reconciliation with the Church. With an air of conscious superiority, intellectual and spiritual, recent authors have condescended to choose some men of ancient fame, to rescue them alike from the superstitious veneration of Catholics, and the unreasoning vituperation of Protestants, to mete out to them praise and blame, admiration and pity, in equal portions. The modern Anglican considers himself the patron, not the client, of the mediæval saint.

One of the most offensive examples of this species of writing is the recent Life of St. Hugh of Avalon. It contains, indeed, some interesting and well-written pages. Had Canon Perry not a real admiration for St. Hugh he would doubtless not have occupied himself with his biography. Yet, when he meets with anything that goes against his Protestant prejudices, it never occurs to him to pause, to consider for a moment that *perhaps* the man, whose virtues he has been relating, *might* be right, and he himself mistaken. He blames at once either the saint or the doctrines and influences that warped his otherwise fine character. But worse than this. His praise is coloured by Protestant prejudice quite as much as his blame. Having undertaken to write a life which as a whole is intended to be laudatory, he naturally does not like to find many facts contrary to his ideal, and is on the look-out for traits of character which may assimilate his hero, in some respects, to the admired Protestant type. Hence he has made several curious blunders, and attributed opinions and acts to St. Hugh, quite at variance with historic truth. Thus, having narrated St. Hugh's eagerness to obtain relics, as related by the saint's companion and biographer, Abbot Adam, Canon Perry thereupon makes the following reflections:—

We wish we could think that it was of himself that he was writing rather than of Hugh, when he gives us so many and such disagreeable stories as to the Bishop's hunting after relics, his eagerness to possess the teeth or some bone of dead saints—an eagerness which occasionally led him into acts of positive dishonesty, as though any means were justifiable for one to obtain possession of these coveted, but somewhat nauseous, treasures. The caring for such things seems to exhibit the Bishop to us in a point of view which contradicts some of the most prominent and admirable parts of his character. He who

could despise reputed miracles, could rise superior to the superstition of the necessity of receiving the Holy Communion fasting, who showed in so many ways his superiority to the opinions of his age, is yet represented as running with puerile eagerness from one shrine to another, and striving by every possible means to add to his collection of the bones of the saints. We gladly turn from such matters to record some more agreeable incidents.\*

Exactly so. But Canon Perry would have acted more wisely and consistently had he turned away altogether from "dead saints," like St. Hugh, to record matters where he would find less to blame, and whereon his praise would be more correctly bestowed, than it has been on the Catholic Bishop of Lincoln.† If he is in search of a priest of the Middle Ages, who rose superior to his times by such strength of mind as is implied in making light of miracles, and breakfasting before communion, why does he not write the life of Wickliff rather than that of a canonized saint? I will show presently that St. Hugh neither "despised reputed miracles," nor "rose superior to the superstition of receiving Holy Communion fasting." So that if, in his modern biographer's judgment, these are "some of the most prominent and admirable parts of his character," since they have no existence except in the imagination of Canon Perry, he ought not to set them over against those other traits of character, which he truly describes, but which offend and disgust him.

I do not care to exonerate St. Hugh from the charge of setting great value on relics. He would no doubt have willingly pleaded guilty. What Canon Perry says about his "positive dishonesty" is another matter. In a note he gives as an example, how the saint being at Fescamp, cut open a silken covering of a relic of St. Mary Magdalen, and then bit off a portion of it.

The monks were horrified (says Canon Perry) at seeing the Bishop put the bone into his mouth and bite off a piece of it, which he slipped into the hand of his attendant chaplain, bidding him carefully preserve it. To the monks, who were greatly scandalized, he made a plausible excuse, but he kept the relics, which, even in a mercantile point of view, were most valuable property.‡

\* Pp. 301, 302.

† As Mr. Perry is not afraid to repeat the language of Vigilantius about the "bones of dead saints," and "nauseous treasures," we need not be afraid to address to him the language of St. Jerome's reply, "Thou lookest upon him as dead, and therefore blasphemest. Read the Gospel: 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. . . . Is it ill done then of the Bishop of Rome, that, over the *venerable bones*, as we think them, over *vile dust* as you think it, of the departed Peter and Paul, he offers sacrifice to the Lord, and accounts their tombs Christ's altars?'"  
—*Adv. Vigil.*

‡ P. 301.

Now the "mercantile point of view" does not seem to have occurred either to St. Hugh, to the monks, or to the writer of the saint's life, who was the very chaplain who received the relic. As Canon Perry omits to give the "plausible excuse," it may be as well to state that the monks were scandalized, not at the theft of the relic, which was made quite openly, but at the apparent irreverence of biting it. St. Hugh's answer was this :—

If we have so lately taken with our fingers, however unworthy, the Body of the Saint of saints, and after It has touched our teeth and lips, have even swallowed It, why may we not confidently handle the members of His saints, since we do it both for their veneration and our own protection? And why may we not, when we have a chance, make them our own, that we may preserve them with due honour?\*

But we are not concerned to defend St. Hugh against Canon Perry's blame, so much as against his praise. He has been much struck with two passages in the life of St. Hugh as written by Adam, in which he thinks that he has discovered an anticipation of Protestantism—contempt of reputed miracles and irreverence towards the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Let us examine these two instances, though the result may be to lower the saint in the eyes of some who have just learnt from Canon Perry to admire him. The saint's contempt for miracles is thus related by Canon Perry :—

A still greater proof of true courage, because it shows a moral courage very rare in the men of his generation, was the way in which Hugh behaved when invited to inspect an alleged miracle. A priest once called upon him to inspect a miraculous appearance in the chalice, where it was said that the actual conversion into flesh and blood of part of the Host could be seen with the bodily eyes. Hugh indignantly refused to look at it. "In the name of God," he said, "let them keep to themselves the signs of their want of faith." He wanted no material proof of the virtue of the Blessed Sacrament; neither would he suffer his attendants, who were eagerly curious to examine the prodigy, to inspect the chalice. To a man so far raised above the common level, the ignorance and materialism of the priests with whom he had to do must have been a constant source of annoyance.†

Before giving a correct version of this history I must explain what Mr. Perry means by the "materialism" of the priests, which he considers so annoying to St. Hugh. He evidently means their belief in transubstantiation; for, in a previous chapter, in analyzing a work of Giraldus Cambrensis, he says, "A great portion of his treatise is occupied with the many revolting details which spring naturally from the *material* view

\* "Magna Vita," p. 318.

† P. 235.

of the Holy Sacrament ;”\* and, again, “ So completely *material* is the view taken of the Eucharist, that it is held that certain material conditions, even under circumstances of the greatest necessity, are required for a valid sacrifice.”† Therefore, as against the material view of the priests of the Middle Ages, Canon Perry records that his patron—I beg his pardon, his client—“ Wanted no material proof of the virtue of the Blessed Sacrament.” The point, then, of the anecdote is that St. Hugh believed in the *virtue* of our Lord’s Body, while his attendants, unable to rise so high, believed in the Real Presence, with an ignorance and materialism which must have been very annoying to so enlightened a man.

We turn to the “*Magna Vita*” to examine this strange phenomenon, a Catholic canonized saint transformed into a half-Calvinist. Certainly, if Canon Perry’s history is to be trusted, he has found a miracle little less wonderful than that of the Host partly converted into flesh. The story, however, as told by Adam reads very differently.‡ St. Hugh was journeying from Paris to Troyes, in the year 1200, when he arrived at the little town of Joi. According to his custom he invited the parish priest to dine with him ; but he, a very old man, absolutely refused this honour. He came to the saint in the afternoon to explain the cause of his refusal, which was his unworthiness, and to ask the saint’s prayers. He was too overcome with shame to tell his story to the bishop himself, but to his attendants he gave the following narrative :—When he was a young priest, he said, he had committed a crime, and then dared to celebrate mass, without penance or confession. One day when his guilty conscience was reproving him in the very act of consecration, he was tempted by a thought of incredulity. He said to himself : “ Can I believe that He who is the Splendour and the spotless Mirror of eternal light allows His Body and Blood to be really consecrated, handled and received, by such a filthy sinner as I am ?” While he was revolving these stupid thoughts (*stolida*) in his mind, the moment came for dividing the sacred Host. He broke it, and blood began to drop from the division, and the particle in his hand took the appearance of flesh. In affright he let it fall into the chalice. He dared not touch it, but covered the chalice with the paten and finished the prayers. After the people were gone he went to the bishop, confessed his sin, and told of the miracle. Since that time the miraculous appearance in the chalice of the half of the Host converted into flesh and the blood which had flowed from it, had always continued, and

\* P. 146.

† P. 147.

‡ “*Magna Vita*,” p. 243.

people flocked from all parts of the country to see it, and to praise God, who alone works wonders. Such was the story of the old priest of Joi, and he asked those to whom he related it to beg the bishop's prayers for himself, and to invite him and his suite to come and behold the miraculous appearance. Those who carried the story to St. Hugh were surprised at his answer. "Well," he said, "in the name of the Lord, let them have these signs of their infidelity. But what are they to us? Shall we wonder at some partial representations of this divine gift, who daily contemplate with the most faithful gaze of our souls this heavenly sacrifice whole and entire? Let him examine with his bodily eyes those little fragments, who does not gaze upon the whole with the internal eyes of faith." Saying this he gave his blessing to the old priest and dismissed him. He thus reproved the curiosity of his attendants, and not only strengthened them in faith, but said to them that what faith teaches ought to be held by the faithful as more certain than what the visible light of day shows to us. This is a very different history from that of Canon Perry. St. Hugh shows no "contempt of reputed miracles." There is not a word to show that he either doubted of the reality of the miracle, or that he did not consider it a divine work. What he said was this:—His faith was so strong that he needed no miracle to confirm it. He believed, without a doubt, that our Lord's whole Body and Blood were in every consecrated Host. Why should he then go and gaze upon a particle? Such ocular proof might be necessary to men of little faith. What was it to him? Had it not been granted by God as a sign to an unbeliever? Let the unbeliever, then, keep his sign and be thankful to God for it. It was out of no contempt of miracles in general, or of this one in particular, that St. Hugh spoke and acted as he did. Had our Lord shown some sign to a saint in reward for his faith and devotion he would have felt very differently and perhaps gone to witness the prodigy, not as needing it to strengthen his faith, but as a token of God's love.

There is a very similar history related in Joinville's "Life of St. Louis." "The holy king related to me," he writes, "that the Albigeois once came to the Count de Montford, who was guarding that country for the king, and desired he would come and see the Body of our Saviour, which had become flesh and blood in the hands of the officiating priest, to their very great astonishment. But the Count replied, 'Ye who have doubts respecting the faith may go thither; but, with regard to me, I implicitly believe everything respecting the Holy Sacrament according to the doctrines of our Holy Mother Church. In return for this faith, I hope to receive a crown greater than the



angels, who see the Divinity face to face, which must make them firm in their belief.' ”\* It is not at all unlikely that, as this event happened only a few years later than that related of St. Hugh, the Count de Montford may have heard of the Bishop of Lincoln's answer, and consciously imitated him. In any case he was influenced by a similar motive; for as the reported miracle had evidently been granted merely to silence or convert the heretics, he deemed it unworthy of his Catholic faith even to appear to put himself on their level. But de Montford did not “despise reputed miracles” any more than St. Hugh. He despised infidels and heretics, and men whose faith in *what the Church teaches* requires confirming by new evidence.

Adam, who was present on the occasion related of St. Hugh, makes the following reflection:—“From this and other words of his I am perfectly confident that not on one occasion only, as has been before related, but often it was granted to him, with the unveiled face of the interior man, to contemplate in a singular manner those things which, though invisible to us, we are all taught to hold with most sincere faith.” The event to which Adam here refers has been related by him at considerable length, and it ought to have shown Canon Perry how little St. Hugh despised visions or miracles or apparitions in the sacred Host. A young cleric of holy life having been sent by repeated heavenly voices to speak to St. Hugh on the sad state of some of the clergy, while assisting at St. Hugh's mass twice saw the sacred Host in his hands assume the form of a lovely child. When he told his message and his vision to the saint they long wept together: the holy bishop bade him keep secret what he had seen, and counselled him to enter a monastery, “since it was not fit that he who had seen and heard such things should remain among the vanities of the world.”†

It is evident, then, that Canon Perry has completely mistaken the meaning of St. Hugh's exclamation: “Bene, inquit; in nomine Domini habeant sibi signa infidelitatis suæ.” What the saint said of one miracle, which God had worked as a rebuke to an unbelieving priest, Canon Perry has taken as a general maxim, as if the saint had some kind of Protestant unbelief in the power or will of God to work miracles, an unbelief which it pleases some to call enlightened faith. This one saying of St. Hugh is the only ground on which Canon Perry asserts that he “attributed the craving after miracles to a want of

\* Joinville's “Memoirs of St. Louis IX.,” p. 361. Bohn's “Chronicles of the Crusades.”

† “Magna Vita,” Lib. v. cap. 3.

faith,"\* which may or may not be true, according as it is understood. Certainly there is nothing whatever to justify Canon Perry in saying that "the details of the miracles, said to have been worked at his tomb seem to accord but badly with the simple and truthful character of the bishop."† There is a double insinuation in these words quite unwarranted. The first is, that there was either some trickery in the performance or some falsehood in the record of the prodigies which testified to St. Hugh's sanctity. The second is that St. Hugh was a man who would have disbelieved such facts, or rebuked such narrations regarding another saint. It is clear, from the account given of him by Abbot Adam, that he would have taken great care to make sure of the miraculous facts, and to guard against imposture; but if once he recognised the hand of God, he would have rejoiced and publicly called on others to share his joy. And this is what happened after his own death. The author just mentioned tells us that when his body was exposed in the cathedral of Lincoln, before burial, it was announced that a woman long blind had recovered her sight by the touch of his body. Some immediately cried out that the bells must be rung and the *Te Deum* chanted. But Adam and the Dean, with whom he was conversing, would by no means allow it (vehementer dissensimus), for the woman was not known and might be imposing. They insisted that the truth in such cases should first be diligently examined, and not published until it had been most certainly proved.‡ The author adds, that in the case just mentioned the long antecedent blindness and sudden cure of the woman were afterwards established beyond doubt.

We may now pass to Canon Perry's second instance of St. Hugh's superiority to his own age, or, in other words, his precocious Protestantism or Anglicanism, in the matter of contempt for the Church's discipline. He writes as follows:—

Hugh would sometimes sit from early morning until late into the darkness of night without breaking his fast, intent upon his labour. But though he was thus careless of himself, he had thought for others, and during the hot weather would oblige the priests who said mass at great Church ceremonials to take some food before the celebration, though this was utterly shocking to the prejudices of his day. Rising in this, as in most other matters, superior to his time, Hugh would reprove the scruples of those who regarded such a direction with horror.§

These words contain a mistake, which is likely to get widely circulated, and though it is of no importance to us that High Church clergymen may be emboldened by it to take their sacramental bread and wine after breakfast, still it is as well that St.

\* "Magna Vita," p. 365.

† P. 328.

‡ P. 376.

§ P. 227.

Hugh should not be regarded as a contemner of the Church's discipline.\* How eagerly Canon Perry's statement will be caught up may be seen from a review of his book in the *Academy* of July 19, 1879. Mr. J. Bass Mullinger, the reviewer, is so pleased with the saint and his new biographer, that he recommends schoolmasters to give this book to their boys instead of the "brilliant but misleading fictions of Scott's 'Crusaders,' or 'Ivanhoe!'" The reviewer, among the other excellent points in St. Hugh's character, mentions that "ascetic though he was, he thought it far better that a priest should break his fast before communion than be tasked beyond his strength in the performance of his functions." Evidently the thing is already growing. Mr. Mullinger's statement is far wider than Mr. Perry's. The latter limits the breakfasting to "hot weather" and "great Church ceremonies," the former allows a general discretion to the priests to take care not to overtax their strength, and assures them St. Hugh was quite decided on the matter. He thought it "far better" to say mass with a full stomach than to endanger health. And this too "ascetic though he was;" as if the fast of asceticism which is undergone in order to subdue the body to the soul were identical with the fast of reverence, which is prescribed for communicants. And yet the account given of St. Hugh's opinions and conduct both by Mr. Mullinger and Mr. Perry is as truly "misleading fiction" as anything of Scott's, though certainly not so "brilliant." What Adam, the contemporary biographer of St. Hugh, says, is this—not that the saint ever dispensed a priest to offer mass, or either a priest or layman to receive communion after breaking fast, for the saint had neither will nor power to do this, except for viaticum—but that he allowed or obliged *occasionally* his assistant priests, deacons, or sub-deacons, to serve at mass after a slight refection, but of course without communicating. First, I will give an exact translation of Adam's words, and then explain whatever may be obscure to modern readers.

Very often (he says) in the great heats of summer he forced some of the ministers of the altar to taste a little bread and wine. For he feared lest, being overcome by the heat, the fast, and the labour, they might not, after such oft-repeated circuits (as they make) in the dedication of churches, be able to assist and minister to the celebrant of the solemnities of the mass, without danger. And when he perceived that, after having at his order tasted bread, some of them felt a horror and a dread of touching during the canon the sacred chalice, or the Lord's winding-sheet (*i.e.*, the corporal), he reproved

\* The present Article was written several months since, and before this blunder of Canon Perry's had been exposed in the *Tablet*. Canon Perry, in a reply to the *Tablet*, defended his view. His defence will be noticed in a subsequent note.

them as men of little faith and discretion, who had neither learnt to obey a superior without hesitation, nor could penetrate the reason of a prudent command (*circumspectæ jussionis*).\*

Several things must be at once evident to any one who considers *attentively* what is here said. First, those who broke their fast were not the "celebrants of masses," they were "some of the ministers of the altar," which is especially the name given to deacons and sub-deacons, or to the priests who take the functions of deacons and sub-deacons at mass. And though the celebrant may also be called the minister of the altar, yet here the ministers are distinguished from the celebrant and have to assist him. Next, it is quite clear that they were not communicants. Otherwise the author, instead of relating their dread of touching the corporal and chalice (which are the especial functions of the deacon and sub-deacon) would have told of their horror at receiving our Lord's Body and Blood after eating. Further, the peculiar occasions on which St. Hugh departed from the ordinary rule are mentioned. He did not publish a general dispensation to all the ordinary ministers of the altar. It was only to some (*quosdam*)—to those, namely, who had to assist at his Pontifical Mass, after having taken part in the laborious ceremonies of the consecration of a church in summer. The frequent circuits (*toties repetitos circuitus*) are not frequent journeys in the country, but the circuits made round the church, both inside and outside, and round the altars with a thurible. The ceremony of consecrating a church with several altars may last from three to five hours. Besides the numerous circuits made by the assistant priests in company with the bishop, at each altar, after a certain point in the service, a priest with a thurible continues the incensation begun by the bishop, moving round and round, or from side to side, not for a few minutes only, but for an hour or more. It was probably those to whom this function fell who were excused from the fast, when, besides the part they took in the consecration of the church, they had to assist the bishop afterwards in the Pontifical Mass. Now, the command of the bishop that they should take a little refreshment was a *circumspect* one, not merely because the heat, fatigue, and giddiness, caused by this long and peculiar function, was a sufficient reason for dispensing, but especially because the bishop only dispensed in a matter to which his power extended. Since the Church, guided in this by the Holy Ghost, requires that the priest who celebrates mass, and the people who communicate, should be fasting from midnight at least, it is absolutely necessary that this rule should be enforced with the

---

\* "*Magna Vita*," p. 140.

utmost rigour. Were there the least loophole of interpretation, or could circumstances justify a dispensation, in a very short time the exceptions would become so numerous, that the rule itself would disappear. Hence, from the earliest ages to the present day, one exception only has been admitted which lends itself to no abuse—viz., the case of those in extreme and dangerous sickness. The obligation is of course ecclesiastical, not Divine, and as such it is in the competence of the Sovereign Pontiff to relax it. But it is only on the rarest occasions that he has exercised this power. The authority of a bishop does not extend to the relaxation of a law so stringent and universal. Had, therefore, St. Hugh obliged priests who celebrated late masses to spare themselves by violating the rule of fast, his command would not have been circumspect but sinful, and his clergy would not have been free to obey him. It was otherwise as regarded the assistant priests, deacons and sub-deacons. The custom which then existed, that they should be fasting when serving at mass, was not of the same stringent nature as the law which bound the celebrant and the communicants. In the earlier ages, indeed, they communicated with the celebrant; but in the time of St. Hugh this was no longer the case, though those at least who acted as deacon and sub-deacon were still expected to be fasting. It was from this custom rather than obligation that St. Hugh dispensed. It is evident that the exercise of such a dispensing power was then unusual; but the saint had good reason for chiding the reluctant and scrupulous. If they could not appreciate his reasons, they might have trusted his judgment. At the present day, the custom or law of fasting, as regards the assistants at the altar, is no longer known, though that which binds the celebrant is rigidly observed. And this confirms what has been said regarding the necessity of rigour. History shows that where a dispensing power was once admitted, the gradual, but inevitable result in such a matter, was the final cessation of the law, or inobservance of the custom. Dispensation was given at first only under rare and urgent circumstances. But when a precedent could be found, and the authority of a saint alleged, the dispensations would be given and asked, under circumstances always less and less urgent; and thus becoming always more and more frequent, in no considerable time they were looked on as a matter of course, or, in other words, the law ceased to bind. So would it have been with regard to the celebrant's fast had St. Hugh acted as his modern biographer supposes. The law of fasting does press hardly on priests, and still more so on bishops. Were exception lawful in any case, there are many, very many circumstances in which it could be lawfully

granted. Frequently both bishops and priests have to remain without tasting food or drink until two o'clock in the afternoon. To fast until one o'clock is a usual occurrence. And often the distress of the long fast is increased by hours of labour or journey, by weakness or racking headache. There can be little doubt that the health of the clergy does suffer from this discipline. Yet if a remedy is desirable, it must be sought, not in a dispensation, which would soon lead to the destruction of a most wise, reverent, and holy discipline, but in a movement on the part of the laity. It is for their convenience that the priests say mass so late. In some cases this is necessary; but in very many, the late mass is imposed on the clergy merely by the indolence and luxurious habits which now prevail.

However, I have not to discuss the reasons of the Church's discipline, but matters of historical fact. The blunder of Canon Perry was not simply the result of inadvertence, but of that self-satisfied erudition which disdains to seek instruction. He was not obliged to know Catholic discipline; but if he chooses to write the life of a Catholic saint, he must not think to interpret it aright by his own lights.\*

That Canon Perry should have blundered over one author is bad enough; but his determination to find Protestantism in mediæval writers is so great, that he has repeated the blunder where not even a shadow of ambiguity or difficulty exists. He points out that Gerald Barry, a contemporary and friend of St. Hugh, held exactly the same lax views as the Bishop of Lincoln about pre-communion fasting. Yet, in the work to which reference is made, Gerald says that no one except in danger of death may receive after breaking his fast: "Nullus nisi jejunos accipiat excepto mortis urgentis periculo."† Nor does he contradict himself in the place indicated by Canon Perry. He merely remarks that if a priest acted otherwise, his consecration

\* Mr. Perry, in a letter to the *Tablet*, Nov. 1, 1879, defends his interpretation as "possibly the correct one," because for a very long period it was a common practice for priests to celebrate with the bishop, for which he refers to Martene. Such erudition is misleading. There was no such thing as concelebration in England in the twelfth century, except at ordinations. Mr. Dimock, who edited the Latin "*Life of St. Hugh*," has been far more modest and careful, and he has avoided such errors. His marginal abridgment of the passage of Adam, over which Canon Perry has stumbled, is as follows: "His consideration for others, compelling them to take food even before the celebration of mass." Though these words have probably misled Canon Perry, still they are accurate; for he does not say "before celebrating mass," which would indicate that they were celebrants. Yet, if the words cannot be charged with error, it would have been well had they been less ambiguous. "Before assisting at mass" would have been a more exact summary.

† "*Gemma Ecclesiastica*," n. 29. (Rolls Ed.)



would be valid, though illicit. "Hanc devotionem sacerdotes omnes exhibeant, ut contriti (et) jejuni celebrent. . . . Si quis tamen pransus celebraret nihilominus conficeret."\*

The same Gerald, in order to amuse his readers, when discoursing on the necessity of clerical science, has given a list of blunders in translating Latin committed by illiterate priests. These were, of course, jokes current at the University of Paris, where Gerald had been educated, or in clerical circles all over Europe, just as at the present day the supposed blunders of undergraduates are collected in the *Art of Pluck*, or as good stories of Scotch and English ministers are strung together in books of anecdotes. One priest, for instance, confounds Barnabas with Barabbas, and instructs his audience that "he was a good man and a holy, but he was a robber." Another, referring to our Lord's words to Simon the Pharisee, about the two debtors, was unable to distinguish between the Latin numerals quingenta (500) and quinquaginta (50), and translated them both fifty. A shrewd magistrate who was present, on hearing Simon's reply that the debtor to whom most was forgiven would love his creditor most, objected that both were forgiven the same amount. The priest, however, was equal to the occasion, and silenced his objector by saying that in one case they were pence sterling, in the other pence of Anjou. Canon Perry has given a few of these stories to illustrate the extreme ignorance of the clergy in the twelfth century. It is to be hoped that no future historian will illustrate the literary attainments and critical acumen of Anglican clergymen of the nineteenth century, by means of the real blunders of Canon Perry.

I have shown that St. Hugh did not merit the praise bestowed on him by Canon Perry, but I do not so much care to defend him from blame, since the qualities which fall under the Canon's censure are often pre-eminently Catholic. Yet the censor's judgments are not always consistent, and when placed side by side present a strange contrast. Take his account of the entry of St. Hugh into the Carthusian order. In very early life he had been placed with the Canons Regular, but on making acquaintance with the Carthusians, when he was already a deacon, he felt himself greatly attracted to their austere life. As Mr. Perry puts it:—

The useful occupations in which Hugh was now engaged did not satisfy his mind. He craved for something higher, more romantic, more difficult, in the way of religious life. . . . For Hugh had completely imbibed the prevalent opinion of his age, that there was no true religion without complete self-immolation.†

\* "*Gemma Ecclesiastica*," p. 25.

† Pp. 176, 177.

His prior became aware of his desire, and exacted from him an oath that he would not carry out his project during his (the prior's) lifetime. Hugh, accustomed ever to yield to obedience, took the oath. But on calm reflection he considered that he was not bound by it, since it interfered with a higher state of perfection, and his prior had no right to require it from him. Canon Perry, after relating this conduct of the saint, writes as follows :—

No plain person would hesitate to pronounce this a sinful action, yet the biographer of Hugh, in his too eager desire to make everything redound to his honour, pretends that he acted by an inspiration from on high. What is more remarkable is that the saint himself, when appealed to in after life as to whether he had ever felt any scruple as to thus breaking his oath, declared that it had never caused him any regret, but only joy. No doubt there is something to be alleged in excuse for Hugh as to this transaction. In the notions of those days plain morality held but a very low place as compared with the glories of the "spiritual life," and Hugh may have been utterly unable to see how any irregularity which led directly to great spiritual triumphs was to be condemned.\*

I can only say that, if no better apology than this is forthcoming for St. Hugh, then Canon Perry requires to apologize for writing his life. Why choose for the subject of biography, among innumerable Christian men and women, one who is "utterly unable" to see that he must not do evil that good may come, one who can see no harm in what every "plain person" will condemn without hesitation; one whose first principles about morality and the spiritual life were confused and topsyturvy? To Catholics, indeed, who share St. Hugh's inability to take the unhesitating view of all plain persons, it will appear that the saint requires no apology. He broke no onerous contract, and he considered that an oath thus taken indiscreetly, and which was a hindrance to higher good, could have no binding force before God. I must add that I have been so accustomed to hear the conduct of such men as Cranmer and Luther lauded, that I am perplexed at this sudden outburst of Protestant zeal for the binding power of a promissory oath. But in a later page Canon Perry seems himself to have forgotten what he has said of St. Hugh's utter inability to take straightforward views, and of his contempt for ordinary morality in comparison with the spiritual life. For after relating how St. Hugh, when bishop, would retire periodically to the Carthusian monastery for prayer and mortification, he says—and here he copies the Catholic biographer, though not quite accurately :—

---

\* Pp. 179, 180.

Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth would speak, and his words would come forth like new wine, fiery and sweet, tempered with the honey of heavenly wisdom. To the laity, and to secular persons unable to practise the more perfect life, he would speak in this wise: "Not alone monks and hermits shall obtain the Kingdom of God. God will not require of any man to have been a monk or hermit, but to have been truly a Christian. That which is truly indispensable in all is that they shall have had love in their hearts, truth in their mouths, purity in their lives." Upon this teaching he would constantly dwell. He would tell the married that if they lived virtuously, they were to be held no way inferior to virgins.\*

As regards this last saying, it is another proof how incompetent is Canon Perry to write a Catholic biography. He intends to set down what he finds in his authorities, but he cannot understand it, and, therefore, cannot reproduce it correctly. To say that virtuous married people are to be held no way inferior to virgins is either to assert what has no meaning or what is a heresy. If such a proposition is meant to regard *persons* it is foolish, for a married person may be of course far superior in virtue, in grace, in charity, in merit, and in glory, to a virgin. But if it is intended to speak of the *state* of marriage as compared with that of virginity, then it is a plain contradiction of the words of our Lord and of St. Paul to assert that the married state is no way inferior to virginity. St. Hugh, however, said something very different. "He taught married persons," says Abbot Adam, "that if they restrained themselves within the limits of what was allowed them, they would not be deprived of the beauty of chastity, but would receive the glory of eternal beatitude, together with both the virgins and the continent." Here is a perfectly Catholic statement that there is a conjugal as well as a virginal chastity, not that they are of equal excellence, though they will both find a reward in eternal glory. St. Augustine had long ago put the matter clearly in his own pithy language: "*Minorem locum habebit mater in regno cœlorum quoniam maritata est quam filia quoniam virgo est. Si vero mater tua fuerit humilis, tu superba: illa habebit qualemcumque locum tu nullum locum.*"† But to go back to St. Hugh's instructions, how does Canon Perry reconcile the statement that to the end of his life St. Hugh, being under the influence of low Catholic morality, never could see the evil of breaking an oath, though every "plain person" understands its sinfulness now without hesitation under the higher Protestant teaching, with his other statement that the saint's constant teaching was that it is truly indispen-

\* Pp. 247, 248.

† Sermon 354. Ad continentes.

sable in all to have *truth in their mouths*, as well as love in their hearts? And why does he in one place represent the saint as making naught of ordinary morality in comparison with the spiritual life, and in another place make him exalt ordinary Christian life to the same level as that of virgins? And if he was so intoxicated with the "glories of the spiritual life" as to lose common sense, how is it that all this sober teaching came from the abundance of his heart, just when he had drunk deepest of that life in a time of retreat?

This is but a specimen of the contradictions into which a writer must fall who tries to praise a Catholic saint from a Protestant point of view. The book abounds in contradictions. They begin in the dedication, in which Dr. Wordsworth, who has throughout his life been possessed with a mania of reviling the Holy See, and proving that the Church of Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, is represented as the successor of the virtues of St. Hugh who was a most devoted adherent and subject of the See of Rome. Over and over again Canon Perry asserts the corruptions and degradation of the English Church were due to its slavery to Rome; yet, over and over again he brings facts, which show it was the influence of the Holy See which alone rescued it from the tyranny of kings and the corrupting influence of courtly bishops. He tells us how much better fitted secular canons must be to advise bishops than monks—"growing up in a routine of duties, which narrowed and dwarfed the mind, without any opportunity of seeing the world and studying the manners and minds of men."\* And yet not only the subject of this biography was a monk, but all the greatest of his predecessors, and very many, if not most, of the great bishops of England; while the chroniclers whose keen remarks on "the manners and minds of men," he frequently quotes with approbation, are nearly all monks.

There is in fact an unreality, an inconsistency, I had almost said an insincerity, about these Anglican accounts of Catholic saints, which must necessarily tend to utter confusion as to doctrine, and consequently to indifference; while this giving of alternate praise and blame is destructive of any consistent standard of right and wrong. In a chapter devoted to the state of the clergy in the time of St. Hugh, Canon Perry has gathered out of a treatise of Giraldus a long list of possible, or actual, abuses or irreverences committed against the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar. He remarks that "Such tricks played about the holiest things gives us a very low idea of the reverence and devotion of the

---

\* P. 11.

time.”\* In this remark every Catholic will cordially agree, provided only that the historical authority of Giraldus is admitted. But we know too well his reckless exaggerations about Ireland, to trust him easily when he speaks of England, or even of his native Wales. Admitting, however, the facts as Canon Perry gives them, on the testimony of Gerald Barry and Walter Mapes, how do they in any way bear out Canon Perry's view, that such deeds were the result of the low material views of the Eucharist—*i.e.*, as he explains, of the belief in Transubstantiation? Nestorians used to write in language very like that of Canon Perry, regarding the “many revolting details which spring naturally from the material view of”—the Incarnation! And many infidels have enumerated the crimes of Christians as an argument against their faith. Christians at the present day take the name of their Redeemer in vain, abuse His festivals by profligacy and by quarrels, and persecute each other through a misconceived zeal for His glory. Suppose now that Canon Perry, instead of raking up the crimes of Catholics in the twelfth century, should have the moral courage to write a book like that of Giraldus, enumerating the crimes of men of his own time and his own Church, and should denounce them in the same bold and perhaps exaggerated language used by the priestly writers of the Middle Ages. And suppose that some writer of the twenty-fifth century, wishing to depict the life and times of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, should discover this imaginary treatise of Canon Perry, and should pick out all its worst passages, and string them together, and call it a picture of the English Church in the nineteenth century. Suppose he should also indulge in reflections that such abominations are just what might be expected from the gross material belief in the Incarnation, which was then prevalent in the Church of England. And if, after these reflections, he should go on to eulogize Dr. Wordsworth, in spite of his having held the same views of the Incarnation which the author has pronounced low and degrading; and should do this by catching at certain words and acts, which he could twist into proofs that he was in reality superior to the superstitious views held by his Church in the nineteenth century, and did not really believe in the material view of the Incarnation at all—would Canon Perry consider this a fair proceeding? Yet if a writer in the twenty-fifth century should do this, he will simply follow the precedent set him by Canon Perry. For St. Hugh held exactly the same faith about the Blessed Sacrament and the Holy Mass which was held by the sordid and unworthy priests whom he

\* P. 148.

denounced and suspended. But they joined to a true faith, irreverence, avarice, and impurity, whereas St. Hugh shows in his life what should be the conduct of a true priest, to whom such mysteries are committed. That is the simple, straightforward view taken by St. Hugh's contemporary biographer, Abbot Adam. I have shown how different, and consequently how inconsistent, and how false to history, is the view worked out by Canon Perry.

T. E. BRIDGETT, C.SS. R.

---

#### ART. IV.—RECENT RESEARCH ON THE NERVES AND BRAIN.

1. *La Psychologie Allemande Contemporaine : Ecole expérimentale.* Par TH. RIBOT. Paris. 1879.
2. *Lehrbuch der Physiologie der Menschen.* Von Dr. WUNDT. Stuttgart. 1878.
3. HERMANN'S *Handbuch der Physiologie.* Band II. and III. Leipzig. 1879.
4. *The Functions of the Brain.* By DAVID FERRIER, M.D., F.R.S. London. 1876.

**A**MONG all the labours of modern science few are more remarkable, and yet few are less generally known, than the attempts which have been made to approach the study of the mind from the side of its material instrument, the nervous system. The amount of labour bestowed on this subject during the last twenty years has been enormous, and although the positive results obtained are proportionately few, owing to its inherent difficulty, many of them are extremely suggestive, and all must have the greatest interest for every student of the human mind. So far as I am aware, no attempt has been made, in England or abroad, to give an outline of the subject in a form accessible to the general reader; and although it is certain that any such sketch must be very inadequate and fragmentary, I think it possible to convey some idea of the lines which recent investigation has taken, to all who will have the patience to follow me. I propose to do this in the next few pages; and I have also another object in view. Having given such an outline as I can of the experimental study of the relations of the brain to thought, I propose to show that none of the conclusions to which modern science leads are in any point opposed to that system of philosophy which is commended to



us by the highest authority. I may go farther, and say that the psychology of St. Thomas, in its general outlines, strikingly anticipated the results of modern physiology; and that the two harmonize and complement each other in a manner which is a strong evidence of the truth of both.

I must premise a few remarks on the nervous system in general. In the most elementary forms of animal life we find that the whole body is able to respond by appropriate movements to impressions made from without. But such movements are necessarily only of the simplest kind, and can exist only in animals of the smallest size; in order that any advance should be made beyond them, certain portions of the elementary substance called "protoplasm" have to be set apart for the reception of external impressions; while others are employed as means of communication between these sensitive organs and the contractile masses of protoplasm which become muscles. The next stage of development consists in a farther division of labour; some parts of the connecting protoplasm being devoted exclusively to the spontaneous origination of impulses to motion, while others have merely to connect these "automatic" centres with the surface of the body or with themselves. In all the higher animals, these two parts of the nervous system are clearly distinguished. The conducting portion, called the "*nerves*," is white in colour, and under the microscope is seen to be made up of small fibres, each composed of a delicate membrane containing a white tube, which in turn is filled with a transparent substance, the whole being about  $\frac{1}{3000}$  of an inch in diameter. The originating portion consists of minute globules called "*cells*," many of which send out branches which become nerve-fibres; an aggregate of these cells is always grey in colour, and is called a *ganglion* or *nerve-centre*.

If the nerves are acted upon, either by these nerve-centres or by some stimulus from without, the impression is transmitted along the fibres so affected until some nerve-centre or muscle is reached. This propagation is ascribed to the existence of a special *nerve-force*, with the intimate nature of which we are no better acquainted than with the other physical forces. It is correlated to them, as they are to one another, and is included in the general law of conservation of energy, being produced by an expenditure of heat, light, electricity, and resulting itself in the production of one of them. It seems to resemble most nearly electricity; and the varying electrical conditions of nerves seem at first sight to justify the popular illustration, which likens the brain to a galvanic battery and the nerves to telegraph wires. But there are several important differences

between the two forces, the chief being the rapidity at which nerve-force travels. Numerous experiments of late years have proved that, far from reaching the marvellous velocities of light or electricity, an impression is transmitted through the nerves at the very moderate speed of 60 to 130 feet per second, varying considerably in different parts of the same nerve, and being accelerated by increase of temperature and greater intensity of the stimulus. The tendency at present is rather to look upon the nerves as made up of a series of molecules of unstable chemical composition: so that a change (probably oxidation) is propagated by a series of explosions all along the line. It has been farther shown, that the nerve-fibres will conduct indifferently in either direction.

I have said that nerve-force originates either in a nerve-centre or in an external impression, and results either in an act of consciousness or in motion. The best examples of spontaneous action are furnished by the ganglia contained in the substance of the heart and blood-vessels, keeping up the movements necessary to life. In the other case an impression may be transmitted up the sensory nerves, and movement may result, without being consciously recognised. The centres for these *reflex* movements, in which ascending impressions are changed into motor impulses, are in the spinal cord. Familiar instances of such reflex actions are sneezing, coughing, and the like; from which it will be remarked that the movements produced by very simple stimuli are often very complicated. They are often also so apparently purposive, particularly in the frog and other lower animals, that some physiologists ascribe a kind of consciousness to the spinal cord. But it is generally held that the total loss of sensation in those human beings whose spinal cord has been severed from the brain by accident or disease disproves this view; and it is more probable that the combination of many movements in one reflex act is due to the gradual connection, in many successive generations, of such as are beneficial to the individual. The higher nerve-centres possess another property of great importance: they are enabled to prevent or check any action produced by ganglia lower than themselves. This power of *inhibition* is difficult to explain; probably two currents meeting in the same nerve neutralize each other in a manner analogous to the "interference" of light or sound.

Bearing in mind these general properties of the nervous system, we shall be able to follow the principal lines which have been adopted for the study of *sensation*. First, as to the change which takes place in the sensory organs when an impression is made on them: there is an increasing probability that there is

in every case some movement of the protoplasm on their surface. This will be readily understood with regard to touch; Hensen has recently shown that the hair-like terminations of the nerve of hearing in an Arctic variety of shrimp vibrate in response to sound; and it is believed that the rays of light cause the pigment-cells in the eye to move, as similar cells move under the same influence in the skin of the frog and the chameleon.

Numerous experiments have been made in order to discover the "minimum sensible"—the least amount of external impression needed to produce a sensation. Thus, it has been found that, in the case of touch, the least weight recognised is  $\frac{1}{100}$ th of a gramme, which is felt if placed upon the back of the hand: in the case of light (far more difficult to estimate), the least which can be perceived is about  $\frac{1}{100}$ th of the brightness of the full moon: these figures being, of course, only averages and subject to great individual variations.

We have next to consider how far the intensity of any sensation corresponds to the degree to which the sense-organ is stimulated. It might be supposed *à priori*, and was actually stated by psychologists, that the two varied in the same ratio; so that, for instance, if one sound or light was double the intensity of another, it would always be felt twice as powerfully. But the matter is by no means so simple, as will be plain if we consider such cases as the following:—Sounds are heard in the dead stillness of the night, and stars are seen in its darkness, which we do not perceive in the day; we readily feel the difference in weight between one ounce and two, but if added to a hundred weight no one recognises a pound. These examples lead us to conclude that we have to take into account, not merely the degree of each sensory impression, but also that which had preceded it, and with which it is compared. The great physiologist Weber expressed this by saying that sensations increase equally in intensity by *relatively* equal increase of the stimulus; for instance, if to three ounces we add first one ounce and then an ounce and a half (one-third of four ounces) an equal increase of weight will in either case be experienced.

Fechner, continuing the study of this subject, was led to discover that the least increment which could be recognised between two sensations amounted, in the case of touch, temperature, and sound, to  $\frac{1}{3}$ , and in the case of light, to  $\frac{1}{100}$ ; and he went on to enunciate what he called the *psychophysical law*, which has given rise to more discussion than any other subject of the kind, and probably more (most readers will think) than its importance warrants. It is this:—A stimulus must increase in geometrical progression in order that the corresponding

sensation may increase in arithmetical progression; or, more concisely stated, *sensation increases as the logarithm of the stimulus*. The searching criticism to which this law has been subjected has proved that it is only strictly true in the case of sight and hearing, and then only within certain limits. Granting these deductions, when we come to ask what is the origin of Fechner's law, we are met by two different explanations. It is held by some to be merely a result of the mode of action of our nervous system; while Wundt, in my opinion more plausibly, gives a psychical explanation. He considers that the mind is not capable of judging absolutely as to any sensation, but can only know it relatively to its predecessor. From this point of view, the psychophysical law is merely a particular statement of the relativity of our consciousness, like the recognition of the pitch of sounds or of the variety of colours. Whatever the ultimate fate of Fechner's law, his real merit consists in having shown (as Berkeley did for the *quality* of sensations) that their *quantity* is not a direct result of the amount of the external cause, but is, to a great extent at least, subjective.

Physiology has so far thrown little or no light on the different *nature* of our sensations as derived from the several organs of sense; but even here some points of psychological interest may be briefly stated. The sense of touch, which has its organ over the whole surface of the body, communicates to us two distinct sensations—one, whereby pressure or resistance is recognised, and another, which informs us whether external objects are warmer or colder than our own skin—these two series of impressions appearing to be conveyed upwards by different nerve-fibres. In the case of hearing, there is still much doubt how the pitch of different sounds is discriminated; the membrane upon which the hair-like ends of the auditory nerve are distributed varies in width, and therefore vibrates in different parts according to the rate of repetition which constitutes the pitch of each note. The different quality of sounds has been shown by Helmholtz to depend upon the number and loudness of the harmonics which accompany the fundamental note, so that the elements upon which our inference of the quality of each sound is based must be highly complex. In the case of sight, again, physiology leads us to discover that what appear to us the simplest sensations are very far from being so. The filaments by which the optic nerve ends in the eye are of two kinds, called, from their respective forms, rods and cones; and Schultze has lately shown it is probable that the impressions of light are transmitted by the rods, while colour is perceived exclusively by means of the cones. No thoroughly satisfactory explanation has been given of the manner in which different

colours are discriminated. It may be supposed, either that there are separate elements in the eye which are differently affected by the three fundamental colours, or (with Wundt) that the varying length of the undulations of light produces different movements in the cones, which we interpret as different colours. Probably the most interesting recent discovery in nervous physiology is that the retinal surface of the optic nerve is coloured by what is termed the "visual purple," which is changed by light into yellow. This visual purple is continually reproduced during life, but can be fixed, in the dead eye, by artificial means, when an "optograph" is obtained of the lights and shades last before it. This is most probably not a stage in the process of vision, but a device for "straining-off" (as it were) those rays of light which, from their intensity and chemical quality, would injure the delicate endings of the optic nerve. Smell and taste have been less studied: but, with regard to the latter sense, it has been discovered that different savours are recognised by different parts of the tongue, and are probably so discriminated.

The manner in which we obtain through the senses our knowledge of extension has been most keenly debated among the physiologists of Germany, who have devoted themselves to the physiological side of the question started by Berkeley. The hypotheses suggested have been classed by Helmholtz as "nativist" or "empiricist," according as they ascribe the origin of this perception either to the innate structure of the organs of sight and touch, or to some psychical process, making it therefore a result of experience. Lotze, who was the first to raise the question in Germany, pointed out that our perception of extension depends on our power of distinguishing between two simultaneous sensations of sight and touch (a power the other senses do not possess); and that for this we must suppose every impression on these two senses has a special character or "local sign," by which its position can be discriminated. He suggested that this local sign is a movement, or tendency to movement, towards any object, which always unconsciously follows upon its sensation. Lotze's theory has been variously modified: Wundt, for instance, considers the process is a conscious comparison between the sensations and the movements excited by them; while Helmholtz has urged that the *à priori* principle of causality is necessary to make the inference valid, by which we conclude these sensations are produced by an external cause, to which we afterwards attribute extension. The empiricist theory, though more generally held, has by no means supplanted the nativist explanation, which has been urged with great ability, particularly in the case of vision, by Hering.

The primary psychological importance of sensation has led me to dwell upon its physiological conditions at undue length. I must hasten more quickly over the rest of my subject.

The spinal cord is continued upwards into the head, where, in the space of less than an inch, it contains the centres for breathing, and for regulating the movements of the heart and blood-vessels. It then spreads out into two fan-like expansions which end in the surfaces of the two halves of the cerebrum, or brain proper. Below the cerebrum there are a series of nerve-centres, of which the cerebellum is the chief, and which have the double office of carrying out the details of the muscular actions decided upon, and of executing all those movements which, though not strictly reflex, are yet so habitual as to need no conscious will on our parts. I need not dwell upon the real complexity of even the most simple voluntary motions; but we are so little accustomed to consider the character of these habitual acts, that it is well to give some examples. Walking, decent eating and drinking, dressing, writing, playing musical instruments, are so many instances of complicated actions which we learn with much thought and labour, but which, after a time, are carried on without our adverting to them at all, the higher centres only originating or inhibiting them. These actions are called "secondarily automatic," to distinguish them from the primarily automatic actions of the spinal cord which I have described before, and which are the result of the experience of the race, as these are of the experience of each individual. They are of enormous importance, even in man and the higher animals, by relieving the brain of much conscious labour; and, as we descend in the scale of vertebrate animals, their proportion to strictly voluntary movements becomes greater, so that fish, reptiles, and birds may almost be called conscious automata. The only instance, in man, of an habitual action of this importance is the maintenance of equilibrium in all the varying positions of the body, which devolves upon the cerebellum. This centre is in close relation with the organs of touch, sight, and hearing; and is also connected with three minute semi-circular canals on either side of the skull, so arranged that the tension of the fluid they contain varies with the position of the head, which is thus directly indicated.

The surface of the cerebrum, or brain proper, is made up of grey matter to the average depth of one-fifth of an inch, and the irregular folds which divide it into "convolutions" greatly increase the amount of this cortical grey substance, so that (according to a trustworthy calculation) it contains some six hundred millions of nerve cells. In the lower vertebrates this portion of the nervous system may be removed without fatal consequences; and it is then found



that all the higher manifestations of life are lost. The animal apparently retains some imperfect sensation, and can execute all reflex and automatic movements; but it has lost all power of comparing sensory impressions, and of originating or regulating its actions. The brainless fish hurries straight on, regardless of obstacles and without any purpose; the frog utters a mechanical croak of satisfaction when stroked; the pigeon will die of starvation over a heap of grain unless its beak be plunged in it, or food be placed in its mouth. In man a similar condition is sometimes produced by disease; when the patient, in a state of trance (all mental activity being apparently suspended), automatically performs all those movements that have become habitual. But, when we come to study the functions of the cerebrum in detail, we are met with the difficulty, that large portions of it may be destroyed by accident or disease without any impairment of sensation and consciousness—nay, that an entire half may be lost without any other symptom than paralysis of the opposite side of the body. This long prevented any attempt to assign definite functions to separate parts of the brain, and the explanation now suggested—that for sensorial and psychical purposes the cerebrum is a double organ, either half of which may act independently—is not wholly satisfactory. The attempts made by phrenologists to localize the functions of the brain were also so unscientific, as to throw discredit on the whole subject, until a mass of evidence was gradually collected to show that destruction of a certain convolution abolished the power of speech. Following this clue, a series of experiments on animals (which Dr. Ferrier has carried out most extensively and successfully), have proved that one portion of the convolutions (corresponding, roughly, to the temples and side of the head) governs the different movements of the body. The motions required for speech are definitely connected with one part of this zone, while those of the face, limbs, and trunk have their several centres in the same region. There is still much debate as to the way in which these centres act; the chief question being, whether their action is direct, or merely indirect, by originating and controlling movements, which are produced by the lower centres; the evidence at present available favours the latter view. Dr. Ferrier has also made it seem highly probable that there are definite points in the hinder part of the brain connected with the several organs of sense and the general sensibility of the body, though little is known of their existence in man. Finally, he believes that the front of the cerebrum contains the centres for the higher mental functions, and his opinion on this head is specially noteworthy. He considers, in common with Prof. Bain and other

authors of the same school, that the faculty of attention is the basis of all higher mental education; and that it is an act of mental inhibition, whereby all psychical activity which is not to the point can be suspended. From the physiological point of view this mental inhibition belongs to the same order of phenomena as the inhibition of reflex and automatic actions; and, like it, demands the existence of special inhibitory centres, which he locates in the front of the brain.

Some very interesting researches have been pursued, into the time occupied by the more simple cerebral processes. These began with the discovery made by astronomers, that the method employed for registering the passage of a star across the meridian in a telescope, by comparing it with the beat of a pendulum, gave rise to an error, which varied in different individuals, but was constant in the same person under similar circumstances. This error, which has been called the "personal equation," is a complicated case, since the observer has to compare two different sensations. When the subject is examined systematically, it is found that the time required to register a sensation by some appropriate movement varies according to certain conditions: when the "minimum sensible" is employed, this time is about one-third of a second for all the senses; but under stronger stimulation it is reduced to about one-fifth of a second for touch and sight, and one-sixth for hearing. It is longer in old persons than in the young, in women than in men, in the uneducated than in those who are accustomed to concentrate their attention; it is also prolonged by fatigue, or by anything which distracts the mind. It is, on the other hand, shortened by a foreknowledge of what the nature of the sensation will be, and still more by its being produced at regular intervals, so as to be anticipated. It is possible to eliminate from the problem the time required for movement, by ascertaining what time must intervene between two sensations for them to be recognised as distinct; this is found to be greatest in the case of sight, least in hearing. The only other point I can here dwell upon is one remarked by Wundt, that if two stimuli are brought before the senses in immediate succession, they always appear to the consciousness as separated by a slight interval, in which neither is perceived clearly. This he ascribes to the time required to divert the attention from the former to the latter sensation.

If any one has had the patience to follow me through this dry summary of recent investigations into nervous physiology, which is all I have been able to give, he will be tempted to ask whether any conclusion of the slightest value can be derived from them, and whether they are not rather so many instances

of wasted time and labour. I can best answer this question by stating the inferences I should myself draw from them.

First, it is interesting to remark that consciousness is brought into contact with the external world at two points only—sensation coming from without, and motion proceeding from within—and at both those points its immediate connection is not with matter, but with force, with those undulatory movements in which there is transference of energy, but not of matter.

Second, the continuity of the nervous system implies the unity of the mind to which it corresponds.\* The grey matter of the convolutions is no doubt more intimately connected with consciousness than any other part of the body, but it presupposes the existence of all the lower nerve centres and organs of sense, which may, so far, be also termed instruments of the mind.

Third, if with Bain, Ferrier, and others, we are to look upon the highest cerebral centres as inhibitory, we can only do so by assuming that there is something beyond the nervous system which causes that inhibition.

In these three directions physiology testifies to the existence, unity, and immateriality of mind, as distinct from its physical instrument. It is, however, to be noted (as Ferrier says) that "no purely physiological investigation can explain the facts of consciousness," which must be approached by a different method.

Finally, the study of the physiological conditions of sensation leads us to the same conclusion as its psychological analysis, that our apparently simplest acts of perception are really highly complex, being made up of a series of more or less unconscious inferences. Our estimate of the *quality* of a sensation appears to be connected with the part of the sensory organs in which it originates; our opinion of its *quantity* depends upon the intensity of the preceding sensation; while the empiricist views of our knowledge of extension are even stronger evidences in the same direction. This is not the place to show how we are not hereby compelled to accept the consequences which Berkeley drew, and which would land us in absolute scepticism.

I must have already over-taxed my reader's patience, and will return to the subject on another occasion, when I hope to show the connection of these physiological discoveries with the psychology and general philosophical doctrines of St. Thomas.

J. R. GASQUET.

---

\* Wundt, "Grundzüge der Physiologischen Psychologie," p. 714.

## ART. V.—A NEW LIGHT ON AN OLD QUESTION.

1. *De Imitatione Christi : being the Autograph Manuscript of Thomas à Kempis, reproduced in Facsimile from the Original preserved in the Royal Library at Brussels.* With an Introduction by C. RUELENS, Keeper of the Department of Manuscripts, Royal Library, Brussels. Elliot Stock. 1879.
2. *De Imitatione Christi, Libri Quatuor.* Textum ex autographo Thomæ Kempensis nunc primum accuratissime reddidit, distinxit, novo modo disposuit; capitulorum argumenta, locos parallelos adiecit CAROLUS HIRSCHKE. Berolini. 1874.
3. *Récherches Historiques et Critiques sur le Véritable Auteur du livre de L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ.* Par Mgr. MALOU, Evêque de Bruges. Troisième Édition. Paris. 1858.
4. *The Authorship of the De Imitatione Christi.* By SAMUEL KETTLEWELL, M.A. London. 1877.
5. *Della Controversia Gerseniana Notizia Illustrativa del P. CAMILLO MELLA, D.C.D.G. Prato. 1875.*

THESE are the veritable gold-letter days of critical scholarship. Only a week or two ago the Trustees of the British Museum won the gratitude of both scholars and students by putting it within their power to examine at their leisure, to take up and put down at their will, to keep on their book-shelves, to have in their own possession, the famous "Codex Alexandrinus," just as it was written, word for word, letter for letter, in the identical Greek characters used by Egyptian scribes more than thirteen hundred years ago. And now, whilst the Philological and Early English Text Societies, availing themselves of the generous trust of the French Government, are taking steps for the solution of linguistic and paleographical problems of high importance by procuring facsimiles of the most ancient record of our native tongue before they yield up the precious loan of the Epinal manuscript, we find, through the success of individual enterprise, the roll of facsimile publications enriched by the reproduction of one of the choicest and most interesting codices of the Royal Library at Brussels: the "De Imitatione," written by Thomas à Kempis himself in 1441.

The great value of this manuscript has always been firmly upheld in the fierce controversy concerning the authorship of the "Imitation" that, with only an occasional lull, has raged for

nearly three centuries ; but it has been reserved to a critic of later times to show that the Codex is in reality of far greater consequence than the early defenders of the rights of à Kempis ever dreamed of, by the discovery in it of a system of punctuation that gives with a delicate precision hitherto unknown in paleography, an insight into the structure of the "Imitation," and the working of the author's mind, such as it is difficult to conceive any one but the author could give, and such, so far as recent discovery can show, as no other author, before or since, ever has given to his readers. This discovery, it is obvious to remark, attaches a very special importance to the facsimile publication of Thomas à Kempis's most perfect copy of his most perfect work.

For nearly two centuries Thomas à Kempis was held, in both the literary and religious world, the undisputed author of the "Imitation." Even Mabillon says that in 1657 he still enjoyed the *fiduciary possession* that had been granted him from early times, whilst Thuillier was compelled to acknowledge that the consensus of public opinion was undoubtedly in his favour when the controversy first commenced. At the end of that time a little cloud arose. A work, erroneously attributed to St. Bonaventure, who died more than a century before à Kempis was born, was observed to contain lengthy citations from the "Imitation." The cloud grew ; it spread over Italy, and before it could be dispelled by the light of irrefragable fact, the eccentric Dom Constantine Cajetan, under its shadow, created his famous mythical author, whom he successively introduced to the controversy as the venerable John Gersen, Abbot of the Order of St. Benedict, and Dom John Gersen, Abbot of Vercelli.\* This was the beginning of the long-protracted dispute between the great Orders of St. Benedict and of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, unparalleled in the history of literature. Cardinal Richelieu despaired of its settlement when, the Benedictines having entreated him to acknowledge their claims for Gersen in his edition of the "Imitation" issued from the Royal Press at the Louvre, at the same time that the Canons Regular set before him the rights of à Kempis, Charles Labbé, charged by the Cardinal to examine into the question, decided against Gersen and Thomas à Kempis alike, and proposed another claimant for the honours of the hotly-contested authorship in the person of John Charlier de Gerson, Chancellor of Paris. But a reaction set in eventually, though not until the Congregation of

\* Finally the Abbot of Vercelli received the additional appellation of "da Canabaco;" but he lost the title of Doctor of Canon Law, which he enjoyed for a short time at the expense of his more substantial brother monk, John, Abbot of Vincelles, in Burgundy.

the Index, the Parliament of Paris, and the French Academy, had each in turn been implicated in the controversy, when, without any definite decision having been come to, little more was heard of it for nearly half a century. In 1724, however, it was renewed with fresh ardour by the German Benedictine Erhard, who published a new edition of the "Imitation," and attributed it to John Gersen, of Canabaco, Benedictine Abbot of Vercelli. This drew forth a reply from no less a person than Eusebius Amort,\* the wittiest, perhaps, as well as the weightiest and most exhaustive writer on the question. His first reply was quickly followed by the "Scutum Kempense," and later by his "Polycrates exauctoratus," which at last silenced the Gersenists, and brought about a fresh period of calm, which endured for thirty years. It was broken by the Abbé Valart, and Amort, then an old man, finding that his reply to Erhard, in 1625, had been resuscitated and attacked anew by Maerz, another German Benedictine, brought the power of ridicule to bear upon his opponent, and afterwards, in rapid succession, published his "Deductio Critica" and "Moralis Certitudo," the result of immense research, which, together with the "Plena Informatio," rank with, if indeed they do not surpass, the works of Rosweyde, of Carré, and of Héser.

In the present century M. de Grégory quickened the strife by the discovery in Paris of an undated manuscript, now well-known as the "De Advocatis," which, by a strong exercise of the imagination and no little disregard of facts, he proved to be the identical Codex of the "Imitation" mentioned in a still more marvellous find in Italy—the stray leaves of a diary of the de Avogadri family—dating from the middle of the fourteenth century: consequently, he argued, the "Imitation" could not have been written by Thomas à Kempis, and therefore it must have been written by Gersen. But in 1849 Mgr. Malou's work appeared, and gave promise of putting an end to the dispute for ever, by demonstrating to the last point the really unquestionable claims of Thomas à Kempis. Before the calm, steady gaze of the Bishop of Bruges the phantom Abbot of Vercelli vanished—

*Et tenues fugit, ceu fumus, in auras.*

Before the irresistible logic of his close reasoning and acute criticism the claims of Gerson dwindled away till there was nothing left but the memory of them; whilst the right of Thomas à Kempis to the glory of the book that ranks second to the

\* Plena et succincta informatio de statu totius controversiæ, quæ de auctore libelli de "Imitatione Christi" inter Thomæ Kempensis Can. reg., et Joannis Gersenis Ord. S. Bened., abbatis patronos jam a centum annis agitur, etc., auth. E. Amort. 1729.



Bible alone,\* attested by the strongest evidence that constitutes historic truth, stood forth in the clear light of reason, resting on the broad indestructible basis of fact and tradition. His masterly treatment of the vast amount of details and collateral evidence accumulated during the course of centuries is familiar to most readers; but since recent Gerseniists† have revived the old legends and fancies and refuted arguments that captivated their predecessors, it is well to recur to it, especially now that one generation has passed away since the force of it was first felt.

I.

Step by step Mgr. Malou proved his case; and, starting with contemporary witnesses, he brought forward no less than fifteen to support it. Of these many were canons regular of St. Augustine, though members of other communities than that to which à Kempis belonged, and consequently witnesses of special weight. The most important is, probably, the chronicler Buschius, who, in 1420, made his religious profession in the Monastery of the Canons Regular at Windesem, which was not more than a mile from the Monastery of St. Agnes, where Thomas à Kempis then held the office of sub-prior. But there is something about the artless style of Brother Hermann Ryd that gives to his unconscious testimony a value of its own. Brother Hermann was a man well known for his piety and learning. In his description of the Convents of the Congregation of Windesem we read:—

The brother who wrote the book, "De Imitatione," is called or named Thomas; he is sub-prior at the said monastery of St. Agnes, near Zwoll, in the diocese of Cologne; and situated a mile from Windesem, which is the Mother-house in which the canons regular of the province of Cologne, Mayence, and Treves hold their general chapter every year. This writer was living in 1454, and I, brother Hermann, of the monastery Novi Operis, near Halle, in the diocese of Magdeburg, having been sent in that year to the said general chapter, spoke to him.

It is wonderful the pride with which the simple monk records what is likely to have been one of the great events of his life—viz., meeting the man whose renown even in those days almost exceeded that of Gerard Groote: "and I, Brother Hermann, spoke to him." But nothing could be more conclusive than the contemporary biography of Thomas à Kempis. The author relates how from his earliest years Thomas à Kempis

\* The "Imitation" has been translated into forty-six different languages, and the editions it has passed through are counted by thousands.

† See P. Mella's "Notizia Illustrativa," and the abridgment of this by a Cassinese Benedictine in *The Tablet*, from Sept. 16 to Nov. 4, 1876.

made so great progress in virtue as to exemplify the words of Scripture: "Happy the man who has borne the yoke of the Lord from his youth;" and these words, he continues, were completely verified in the several treatises that he wrote, especially in his "*Soliloquium Animæ*," in which Christ converses with his soul, as with his spouse. This good Father, he proceeds, was wont to say, when walking with the community or with others: "My dear brothers, I must leave you; some one is waiting for me in my cell." And then he would go away and pray. And thus was fulfilled in him the promise: "*Ducam eum in solitudinem et ibi loquar cum eo*" (Osee. ii. 14); and Thomas himself would say to the Lord: "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth" (1 Kings iii. 9). We know, further, what he used to say to the Lord, and what they said to one another, by his treatise: "*De interna Christi locutione ad animam fidelem*" (the third book of the Imitation), the second chapter of which commences: "*Loquere Domine; quia audit servus tuus.*" The recently-disclosed evidence of Adrien de But, however, is of perhaps even greater value. The Royal Commission of History of Belgium, whose publications correspond to our admirable Rolls Series, brought out in 1870, under the careful supervision of Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, the *Chronicles of Adrien de But*, a monk of the celebrated Cistercian Abbey of Dunes, the friend and disciple of Gilles de Roye. These *Chronicles* date from the year 1431, and are continued up to 1488, the year of Adrien's death. Between the record of the projected alliance with England and Burgundy, sought by Margaret of York, Dowager-Duchess of Burgundy, in 1480, and the rebellion of the Venetians, tributaries of the Turks, against the Sovereign Pontiff Sixtus IV., that led Ferdinand of Arragon to declare himself the defender of the Church, and brought him into conflict with the Mussulman, occurs the following remarkable passage: "*Hoc anno frater Thomas de Kempis, de Monte Sanctæ Agnetis professor ordinis regularium canonicorum, multos, scriptis suis divulgatis, edificat; hic vitam sanctæ Lidwigis descripsit et quoddam volumen metricæ super illud: qui sequitur me.*"\* Now, in the face of the positive, conclusive testimony of contemporary witnesses cited by Mgr. Malou—space forbids us to give more than three of the fifteen—and of the striking one we owe, above all, to the Royal Commission of History, Gersénists and Gersonists would cease to be, one would think, unless they could rebut it by the

---

\* Commission Royale d'Histoire. *Chroniques relatives à l'Histoire de la Belgique sous la domination des Ducs de Bourgogne* publiées par M. le Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove. Tome i. Bruxelles. 1870.

numerical superiority of their contemporary witnesses. Gersenists and Gersonists exist; but neither can produce one single contemporary witness proving the right of Gersen or Gerson to the authorship of the "Imitation." Nay, the Gersenists have yet to prove that their man ever lived. The so-called decisive proofs afforded by historical tradition recently adduced in favour of Gersen are, we speak advisedly, simply worthless, and have long since been refuted over and over again; so that to give them a categorical reply would be a sheer waste of time. One or two examples will suffice to show this. The Cassinese Monk, to whom English readers are indebted for the version of P. Mella's "Notizia Illustrativa" that originally appeared in the "Civiltà Cattolica" says: "The ancient catalogues of Abbots of St. Stephen's in Vercelli give us the name of John Gersen as having governed that celebrated abbey from 1230 to 1245. In support thereof, we appeal to four unimpeachable authorities. First, the Bishop of Saluzzo, Francesco Agnostino (*sic*) della Chiesa, who held the office of historiographer to Charles Emmanuel of Savoy, surnamed by his own countrymen the Great. In his history of Piedmontese writers, published at Turin in 1845, he printed from the archives of St. Stephen's the names and dates of all its abbots from 1172 to 1536. At the year 1230 the catalogue gives us: "John Gerzen, who wrote the book of 'The Imitation of Christ.' These archives perished at the French Revolution." Now, mark the words of Mgr. Malou answering this argument, which is merely a repetition of M. de Grégory: "Augustin della Chiesa made no mention of Gerson in his 'Catalogue of Illustrious Men of the Town of Vercelli,' published in 1614. It was not till 1648, *four years after Dom Cajetan had published his last conjectures*, that Augustin della Chiesa counted Gersen amongst the writers of Piedmont. Then he had so much confidence in the assertions of Dom Cajetan, that he affirmed, on the authority of this author, that the autograph manuscript of the "Imitation" still existed in the Monastery of St. Stephen at Vercelli, *which had been destroyed a long time before the period at which he wrote*. After the replies of Naude and Père Fronteau, Augustin della Chiesa omitted the name of Gersen in the editions of his "History of the Writers of Savoy," published in 1657 and 1660. We are told, moreover, that the Abbot Frova, interrogated by Amort concerning the Abbots of St. Stephen's, replied, in 1762, that the catalogue of the Abbot's did not exist, but that by his own researches he had succeeded in discovering in the archives of the town the names of the following Abbots:—Robald, from 1206 to 1219; Peter, Abbot in 1243; William, Abbot in 1320 till 1340. He did not discover any Abbot of St.

Stephen of the name of John before the year 1491. Hence the only list of Abbots extant in the eighteenth century shows that at the time when Gersen is said to have enjoyed the dignity of Abbot, Peter was Abbot. Again, P. Mella's translator says :—

The annals of the Franciscan Order, compiled by Father Luke Wadding, of Waterford, as we mentioned in our first Number, tell us that St. Anthony of Padua, and Adam Marisco, disciples of St. Francis of Assisi, studied under Abbot Gersen, at Vercelli. That these two children of St. Francis frequented the schools of Vercelli in Gersen's time is of absolute and undisputed historical certainty; that Gersen was himself a lecturer in the university is all but certain, as it is perfectly certain that he addresses part of his work to university students (1); hence the Franciscan tradition has every appearance of being authentic.

To deal with such loose writing is a very great exercise of patience. Gersen must have been Abbot of Vercelli, because the Annals of Luke Wadding as good as say that he was; the Annals of Luke Wadding must be true, because they as good as say that Gersen was Abbot of Vercelli. Is that what is meant? But where does Wadding mention the name of Gersen? All that we can find on the matter in his "Annals" is, that St. Anthony of Padua, accompanied by Adam de Marisco, was sent to Vercelli to study under the Prior of St. Andrew's, not of St. Stephen's, observe, whose name Wadding does not give. But though Wadding does not, Oudin, Fabricius, and Jöcher, not to mention others, all give us his name. The famous Abbot of St. Andrew's, under whom Antony of Padua studied mystic theology to such purpose that the pupil beat the master, was no other than Thomas, Canon of St. Victor's at Paris, and afterwards the first Abbot of St. Andrew's, at Vercelli, renowned for his commentaries and translation of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite. Once more, the Cassinese Benedictine endeavours to support the cause he has espoused by quoting the authority of Bellarmine. For this purpose he refers us to the 1613 edition of his "*De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*." But why did he not refer us to the later editions of the Cardinal's work? Had he done so, far from giving us a witness in favour of Gersen, he would have introduced us to one dead against the claims of any one but Thomas à Kempis. We have been unable to meet with a copy of the edition printed at Cologne in 1621, and quoted by P. Strozzi and others; but in both the editions of 1657 and 1684 we find the same passage that they cite from the earlier edition :—

*Scriptos et compositos esse ab eodem Thoma quatuor libros de Imitatione Christi supradictos, contrariis conjecturis eversis, demonstrat evidenter in vindiciis Kempisibus P. Heribertus Rosweyodus : ejus*

mihi et rationes plenissime satisfecerunt, et sententiam penitus amplector.

After this, it will be refreshing to go back to Mgr. Malou, and no one will complain if we quote at length the acute remarks with which he sums up this section of his subject. "A tradition well established for more than thirty years before the death of an author, and held without question for more than thirty years after his death, cannot be reasonably suspected. This tradition is, above all, legitimate and incontestable when it has been preserved by a body of men, a society, a religious order, all the members of which knew one another, helped one another, watched over one another, and could neither conspire together to deceive the public nor be deceived themselves concerning a fact that occurred under their own eyes."

It may be added that it is unheard-of in the history of letters, that an ancient work should be attributed to a modern author. Often a modern work has been attributed to an ancient author in order to win for the former greater authority; but the contrary has never been done, and never could be done. But this is just what, according to the Gersenists, would have taken place: the "Imitation," after having been in existence two centuries, would have been ascribed to Thomas à Kempis, who never wrote it. Such a plagiarism is impossible, especially in the case of so remarkable a work as the "Imitation of Christ."

It is necessary, therefore, to accept the contemporary, domestic, uncontested, universal tradition we have proved, or to fall into absolute historical scepticism.

To fully appreciate the value of the historical proof set forth, we must bear in mind—1st, that the partisans of Gersen and Gerson are unable to silence a single one of the fifteen witnesses cited; 2ndly, that the adversaries of Thomas à Kempis cannot produce a single contemporary witness in favour of Gersen or Gerson; 3rdly, that it is now superfluous to discuss proofs that can be drawn from manuscripts, idioms, and the contents of the work, because the cause of Thomas is absolutely gained before approaching this secondary and accessory kind of demonstration; 4thly, that the question relative to the real author of the "Imitation" is henceforth definitely decided; so that all ulterior discussion can only have for its object to confirm the demonstration already achieved, and to dissipate the illusions of the adversaries of Thomas à Kempis.

## II.

Passing to the question of manuscripts, Mgr. Malou, admitting only those bearing the name of the author and a certain

date, or that supply for this by other material, incontestable evidence, cites no less than forty-five codices, including the oldest and most correct, that confirm the rights of à Kempis. Undoubtedly manuscripts are not of the same weight as historic evidence; but still we are far from sharing the opinion of M. Darch, that they ought to be disregarded because they obscure the question; nor can we agree with M. Vert, who maintains that in this controversy printed texts are preferable to manuscripts, which, like the chameleon, take too easily the colour of the carpet they touch, and lend themselves with extreme facility to the manipulations of expert forgers; rather we accept the judgment of the learned Rossi, that paleographical proof *used with discernment* is assuredly not without value, and once more follow the guidance of the Bishop of Bruges. The first and oldest manuscript of the "Imitation" Mgr. Malou draws attention to is the Kirkheim: at the foot of the first page it bears these notable words:—"Notandum quod iste tractatus editus est a probo et egregio viro, magistro Thoma, de Monte Stae. Agnetis et Canonico regulari in Trajecto, Thomas de Kempis dictus, DESCRIPTUS EX MANU AUCTORIS IN TRAJECTO; ANNO 1425, IN SOCIATU PROVINCIALATUS." This shows that there existed an autograph copy of the "Imitation," a copy evidently held in great esteem, in the Mother House of the Province before the year 1425; and that to this house people had resorted for the Kirkheim Codex, which owed its value to the fact of its having been copied from the autograph of Thomas à Kempis. Transcribed in the year 1425, the manuscript was written forty-six years before Thomas à Kempis died; and it is the oldest dated manuscript bearing the name of the author. The oldest dated manuscript bearing the name of Gersen, the Parma, is of the year 1464, that is—supposing Gersen ever lived, and supposing that he died the year he ceased to be Abbot of St. Stephen's—219 years after his death. The most ancient dated manuscript with the name of Gerson, the Sagermensis or Bretonianus, is of the year 1460—namely, thirty-one years after Gerson's death. So that the oldest dated manuscript bearing the name of Thomas à Kempis is older by thirty-five years than the oldest with the name of Gerson, and thirty-nine years earlier than the oldest bearing the name of Gersen. And nothing has been produced, we will not say to refute, but to impair this weighty deposition of Mgr. Malou. M. Loth's papers\* may have appeared to some to do so; but his elaborate and fanciful argument, based on calculations made from a calendar acknowledged by

---

\* "Revue des Questions Historiques." Avril, 1873; Janvier, 1874; Octobre, 1877.



himself to bear evident traces of error on the part of the scribe, is valueless. M. de Laborde first drew attention to the so-called 1406 manuscript in 1869, for a purpose very different from M. Loth's. The Codex contains, in addition to the first book of the "Imitation," two old engravings known to and valued by collectors as engravings *en criblé*. If these could be proved to be anterior to 1418, then Paris would possess a treasure more precious than the Madonna of the Royal Library of Brussels, the celebrated St. Christopher of Lord Spencer, the St. Sebastian of the Imperial Library of Vienna.\* There lies the real history of the ingenious discovery of the 1406 manuscript of the first book of the "Imitation." For the rest, M. Charles Ruelens tells us that when he first opened the volume he at once exclaimed to M. de Laborde, "This MS. is of the sixteenth century."† M. de Laborde answered, "You are not the first of that opinion." And a closer inspection of it did not cause M. Ruelens to change his opinion. As regards the Rouge Cloître manuscript, belonging to Count Riant, the date affixed to it by M. Loth is purely arbitrary. The codex is, in fact—and here again we are indebted to M. Ruelens for our information—a *raparium*, a collection of treatises written at various times by various writers, and having nothing in common but the binding. One treatise alone bears the date 1416, and it is by a different hand to that of the first book of the "Imitation." Five different handwritings—and M. Loth has abstained from saying this—are contained in the manuscript, one of which belongs to the end of the fifteenth century. M. Ruelens has carefully studied it; he has had photographs taken of five separate pages, to show the variety of handwriting, which he has submitted to several paleographers, all of whom confirm his judgment: he sent them to us, and we in turn submitted them to Mr. Maunde Thompson, who says there is no doubt about the matter. However, as M. Ruelens has handed over all his notes relating to the matter to Dr. Hirsche, it is probable that before long we shall see it fully discussed in the forthcoming second part of the *Prolegomena*.

Next after the Kirckheim manuscript ranks the Gaesdonck, also of 1425, and then the famous 1441 Autograph, written throughout by the hand of Thomas à Kempis, and containing all the four books of the "Imitation." The Indersdorf of 1441 follows; it bears the inscription: "Tractatus qui intitulatur de Imitatione Christi; compilavit quidam canonicus regulæ Si. Augustini episcopi." But not to weary by the bare enumeration

\* *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Tom. prem. Paris, 1869.

† See also on this "Les Récentes Recherches sur l'Auteur de l'Imitation de Jesus Christ." Par Ad. Delvigne. Bruxelles, 1877.

of manuscripts that ought to be sufficiently well known to prevent any one being misled by P. Mella's\* apparently formidable array, we would merely add that against the forty-five manuscripts in favour of the Monk of St. Agnes, comprising the most ancient with name and date, the Gersenists can bring only sixteen, including those where their author is designated Chancellor of Paris; the Gersonists quote twenty, two only of which are dated; whilst of the two hundred known manuscripts of the "Imitation," dated and undated, with and without the name of an author, three-fourths of them belong authentically to Germany or the Low Countries. Moreover, the intrinsic evidence that follows is so overwhelming that, were it compatible with a regard to veracity, it would be quite possible to play the very spendthrift in concessions to Gersenists and Gersonists alike in the matter of manuscripts, without in the least invalidating or even weakening the cause of à Kempis.

### III.

Thomas Haemmerlein, commonly called à Kempis, who lived to the great age of 92, was born in 1379 at Kempen, in the diocese of Cologne. The school in which he was formed, and of which he was one of the most illustrious members—the school of Gerard Groote, of John vos van Heusden, of Florent Radewyns—was a celebrated one; it was marked by distinct characteristics; and its disciples were trained to the discharge of special duties. Now, what were the characteristics of this school? What was its origin? What manner of man was he who founded it? Gerard Groote was a very remarkable man; a man of immense force of character, of high intellectual gifts, of great generosity of disposition, of deep religious feeling. He passed a brilliant career at the University of Paris, eagerly devoting himself to every kind of knowledge within his reach. Nothing came amiss to him: theology, medicine, magic, astronomy, astrology; each in turn arrested

\* With reference to the Augsburg MS., it may be well to remark that Denis (Bibl. Palat. Vindob. iii., DCXCVII.) far from ascribing to it the date 1383 (see P. Mella and *The Tablet*), sets it down to the XV. century; and elsewhere (ii., DLXXXIV.) commenting on another MS. of the same date he says: "Unde facile coaevus Thomae de Kempis esse potest." Concerning the Wiblingen MSS., it is only necessary to say that Prof. Weigl, and the Abbot Martin Gerbert, have done anything but prove their dates. And it would have been more frank, to say the least, had the writer in *The Tablet* told us that the second Wiblingen MS.—one of the three "that, it is plain, are alone enough to set the question at rest for ever"—consisted of only the first chapter of the first book and a few sentences of the second, wretchedly torn ("misere etiam lacerati") when Gerbert saw it in the last century.

his attention. He spent large sums in the acquirement of rare manuscripts, and having at eighteen taken his Doctor's degree at the Sorbonne, he went to complete his studies at the University of Prague. Then he returned home, and, for a while, enjoyed the good things of this life—fame, wealth, honours. But a grave sickness fell upon him; and we gain a curious glimpse of the times when we read that, lying at the point of death, it was not without a struggle that he yielded up his precious manuscripts on magic and astrology to be publicly burnt, when his confessor required this sacrifice as the condition of his receiving the last Sacraments. The reward of the sacrifice was, it would seem, the power to make another. Influenced by his friend and former mentor at Paris, Henri de Kalkar, Prior of the Chartreuse of Arnhem, he resigned his rich prebends to the Pope, divided his patrimony, and the brilliant scholar who had surpassed all the Canons of Cologne in the magnificence of his laces and furs, clothed in a habit of coarse grey serge, went to learn in solitude, by the practise of severe austerities, the self-restraint that afterwards fitted him to be a ruler of men. He reformed himself before he attempted the reformation of others.

When he began his mission of reform, and first preached "Modern Devotion" (*Moderna Devotio*), a band of disciples quickly collected around him, prominent among them being Florent Radewyns, the dear master of Thomas à Kempis, a Canon-priest of St. Martin's of Utrecht, who gave up his canonry and became a simple Vicar of St. Labwin at Deventer, in order to enjoy the intimate companionship of his venerated guide, and Jean vos van Heusden, afterwards one of the first Priors of Windesem. Still possessed with his passion for learning and the acquisition of choice manuscripts, Gerard Groote picked out the best scribes from amongst the poor students, lay and ecclesiastical, who, flocking to the Capitular School of Deventer, were attracted by his teaching, and employed them in transcribing the most correct and perfect texts, which he spared no pains to secure for the valuable library—rich in the works of Cicero and Seneca, where the Epistles of St. Paul stood side by side of the lives of Plutarch, and Virgil, and Plautus in close proximity to the writings of St. Augustine and St. Bernard—which he ultimately left to the House of Deventer, on condition "that three Brothers should always remain in charge, to take care of the volumes and to lend them liberally." Under the organization and direction of Radewyns, inspired by Gerard Groote, these students, in the course of time, formed themselves into a Community. And this was the origin of the Institution of

the Brothers of Common Life, which spread throughout the Low Countries, in Flanders, in Westphalia, and even in Saxony.\* The members were not bound by solemn vows, but they were obliged to practise obedience, poverty—that is, no one was allowed to hold property independently of his companions—continence, humility, and above all charity. Their hours of transcribing, and prayer, and work, and recreation, and sleep, were all carefully regulated. And so anxious was Gerard that the intellect should not be blunted by the prolonged mechanical labour of copying, that he required each clerk to make extracts of the most beautiful maxims of the Saints and Fathers, and to add his own reflections in certain books called *rapiaria*; and it is related that he himself, according to his wont of uniting example with precept, wrote and published many works of this kind, though hitherto none of them have been discovered. Who can fail to see in this ordinance the first step towards the compilation and composition of the “Imitation?”

The Brotherhood held regularly each year a general assembly of priests, clerks, and laymen, delegated by the various houses of the Low Countries, to elect the Rector of the whole Confraternity. After a time, the first disciples of Gerard Groote, in compliance with the dying wish of their master, adopted the rule of the Canons Regular, and so embraced the religious state strictly so called. But the Institution of the Brothers of Common Life was not abandoned: it worked on harmoniously in conjunction with the Canons of St. Augustine, and the Community of Florent Radewyns at Deventer became a sort of general noviciate for both Societies. The Monastery of Windesem, founded by Radewyns and Hendrik de Wilsem, quickly grew in importance. The rule of St. Augustine was rigorously observed there. Like the Brothers of Common Life, the Canons Regular occupied themselves with manual labour, agriculture, and other industries. And, like the Brothers of Common Life, they too became renowned for their penmanship; they were distinguished for their knowledge of sacred and profane literature; and their library, surpassing in the value of its codices every other of the Congregation, contained some of the most ancient manuscripts of the Vulgate, purchased at a great cost in Paris and the Convents of St. John of Jerusalem in Germany. To the Chapter of Windesem were quickly aggregated the Convents of St. John at Amsterdam, of Vredeswell near Münster, and, finally, that of St. Agnes, at Zwolle. In the following century all the convents of the Canons of St. Augustine in the Low Countries, in Ger-

\* “Magister Gerardus Magnus primus fuit hujus nostrae reformationis pater, et totius Modernae Devotionis origo; verusque his novissimis temporibus hujus nostrae terrae apostolus. . .”—Chron. Windesem.

many, and in the north and south of France, became subject to the same Chapter.\*

And now that we have before us something about the founder, something about the origin of the school of Modern Devotion, it is necessary to recall something of its other characteristics, its mental, its religious features. The pages of the authors of Windesem reflect the teaching of their masters, they are filled with the precepts of Gerard Groote, Van Heusden, and Radewyns. Both Thomas à Kempis and Buschius, not to mention others, inculcate without ceasing, in their several writings, the duty of imitating Jesus Christ, of walking in His footsteps, of meditating on His Passion, of seeking solitude and silence, of loving the cell, of avoiding vain and worldly conversation, of fleeing honours, of mortifying the flesh, of striving after perfection, of meditating on the Holy Scriptures, of walking in the footsteps of the Fathers. Now, if any should say they have read the "Imitation," yet do not see in it the amplification, the development of this teaching, nay, if they do not see in its ruling thoughts a perfect identity with the ideas that run through these precepts, they must have read it with their eyes shut; and we would beg them once more to consider the following extracts from the letter of John van Heusden, arranged by Mgr. Malou in parallel columns with passages from the "Imitation," and then to say whether there is not a similarity of thought and expression between them, altogether too remarkable to be the result of mere accident.

JOHN VAN HEUSDEN.

*Vita D. N. Jesu Christi* quæ nos præcessit, fons est omnium virtutum, qua mediante ad omnes virtutes citius pervenitur, sine qua ad veras virtutes et ad suum amorem pervenire non possumus. ("Ap. Buschium, Chron. Windesem," p. 221.)

Quia exercitium et cognitio pariunt amorem, idcirco necesse est ut prius in ea exerceatur, et qui ista negligit, quamvis haberet et sciret omnem Bibliam et Scripturam, et Legem unquam positam aut conscriptam, id minime sufficeret. (Loc. cit.)

THE AUTHOR OF THE "IMITATION."

Qui sequitur me non ambulat in tenebris; hæc sunt verba Christi, quibus admonemur quatenus *vitam ejus* et mores imitemur, si velimus veraciter illuminari, et ab omni cæcitate cordis liberari; summum igitur studium nostrum sit in *vita Jesu Christi* meditari. ("De Imit," lib. I., c. 1.)

Qui autem vult plene et sapide Christi verba intelligere, oportet ut totam vitam suam illi studeat conformare. Si *scires totam Bibliam* exterius et omnium philosophorum dicta quid totum tibi prodesset? ("De Imit," lib. I., c. 1.)

\* M. Bonet-Maury, to whom we are mainly indebted for these details, has published documents of considerable importance in his "Gérard de Groote, d'après des documents inédits." Paris. 1878.

Eorum insipice multiplices et graves labores, et quam perfecte Deo obtulerunt *amicos et cognatos* omnes, et possessiones, temporalia bona et mundi honores. (Ibid., p. 230.)

Quid dulcius, O dilecte frater, quid securius, quid simplici columbæ salubrius, quam in petræ foramine, hoc est in *Christi Jesu vulneribus delitescere* et requiescere. (Ibid., p. 244.)

Ad externa officia nullatenus, dilecte frater, aspires, nec aliquam *prælaturam* affectes. (Ibid., p. 237.)

Libenter, cum potest fieri, *solus* sis. (Ibid., p. 218.)

Nihil penitus agas sine *consilio*; et plus semper expertis, quam tibi ipsi credas. (Ibid., p. 239.)

Humilis corde sis et apparatu, et *nimis multum non teneas de te ipso*. (Ibid., p. 241.)

*Ama nesciri*, et ab aliis contemni opta. (Ibid., p. 242.)

Juxta hunc modum fratres *devotarum congregationum*, et fratres in Vindesem, se solent exercere. (Ibid., p. 246.)

Intuere SS. Patrum *vivida exempla*. Omnibus divitiis, dignitatibus, *honoribus, amicis, et cognatis* renunciabant. ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 18.)

Requiesce in passione Christi, et in sacris vulneribus ejus libenter habita; si enim *ad vulnera ejus devote confugies*, magnam consolationem senties. ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 1.)

Multo tutius est stare in subjectione quam in *prælatura*. ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 9.)

Pete secretum tibi; ama *solus* habitare tecum. ("De Imit.," lib. III., c. 53.)

Cum sapiente et conscientioso *consilium* habe; et quære potius a meliore instrui, quam tuas adinventiones sequi. ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 4.)

Hæc est altissima et utilissima lectio, sui ipsius *vera cognitio* et despectio, *de se ipso nihil tenere*. ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 2.)

*Ama nesciri* et pro nihilo reputari. ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 2.)

Utinam in te non dormiret profectus virtutum, qui multa sæpius vidisti *exempla devotorum*! ("De Imit.," lib. I., c. 18.)

It seems almost impossible to advance a step in this question without lighting upon a fresh proof of the identity of Thomas à Kempis and the author of the "Imitation." Take the concluding words of the final sentence just quoted, "*exempla devotorum*." The terms "*Devotus*," "*Devotio Moderna*," were distinctive of the disciples and institutions of Gerard Groote; and the former, whether as clerks or laymen they were undergoing their probation in the noviciate of Florent Radewyns at Deventer, or whether they had joined the Society of the Brothers of Common Life, or had been admitted into a monastery of Canons Regular, or of Carthusians, all equally bore the name of *Devoti*. The religious of the Congregation of Windesem frequently used it in their writings, in a distinct appellative sense; and Thomas à Kempis, a Devout of the Devout, uses the words



Devotio, Devoti, Devotorum, in this way no less than four hundred and forty times in his undisputed works. The author of the "Imitation" employs the words Devotio and Devoti in precisely the same significant way that they were used by the disciples of Gerard Groote and Florent Radewyns.

BUSCHIUS.

Sicut magister *Gerardus Magnus* origo fuit et pater primus omnium hominum *Modernæ Devotionis* hujus patriæ, ad quem Deo servire cupientes, securum semper habuere recursum, et post eum pater venerabilis, dominus *Florentius Radervini*, primus rector congregationis clericorum in Daventria, ita *devotus* pater noster, frater *Joannes de Heusden*, prior in Windesem eorum fidelis factus est successor, in cura consulendi, auxiliandi et defendendi. ("Chron. Windesh," lib. I., c. 15.)

*Devotus* frater *Johannes de Heusden* jussus est ad altiora conscendere, et ad sacros ordines promoveri. . . . Factus presbyter *devotus* frater. . . . (Ibid., I. II., c. 12.)

*Devotus* pater *Willelmus Wornecken* circa Eucharistiæ venerabile sacramentum valde fuit timoratus. (Ibid., I. II., c. 49.)

*Devotissimi* fratris *Gerlaci* vitam describere aggredimur, cujus interna *devotio* externis indiciis sæpius resultare videbatur. . . . Addebat *devotus* *Gerlacus Petri*, ideo semper nova mentis renovatione ad hæc sacramenta debere *quemlibet Devotum* sese disponere, quod, &c. . . ("Chron. Wind.," lib. II., c. 55.)

THOMAS A KEMPIS.

*Devotus* pater *Florentius*, dum divina mysteria celebraret, Christus cor ejus et animam spiritualis lætitiæ vino potissimum replevit. ("Vita Florentii," c. 3.)

THE AUTHOR OF THE "IMITATION."

Quando recordeor *Devotorum* aliquorum ad sacramentum tuum, Domine, cum maxima *devotione* et affectu accedentium, tunc sæpius in me ipso confundor et erubesco, quod non ita vehementer sum attractus et affectus, sicut multi *Devoti* fuerunt, qui præ nimio desiderio communionis et sensibili cordis amore, a fletu se non poterant continere. . . . Licet tanto desiderio tam *specialium Devotorum* tuorum non ardeo, tamen de gratia tua illius magni inflammati desiderii desiderium habeo. ("De Imit.," lib. iv., c. 14.)

Omnium *Devotorum* jubilationes, ardentes affectus, mentales excessus, et supernaturales illuminationes, ac cœlicas visiones, tibi offero et exhibeo. ("De Imit.," lib. iv., c. 17.)

Offero tibi omnia pia desideria *Devotorum*. ("De Imit.," lib. iv., c. 9.)

Potest *quilibet Devotus*, omni die ad spiritualem Christi communionem et sine prohibitione accedere. . . . toties mystice communicat quoties Incarnationis Christi mysterium, Passionemque *devote* recolit, et in amore ejus accenditur. ("De Imit.," lib. iv., c. 10.)

Multi *Devoti* fuerunt, qui præ nimio desiderio communionis, . . . a fletu se non poterant continere. . . . ("De Imit.," lib. iv., c. 14.)

Quum igitur studii causa, in annis adolescentiæ Daventriam pervenissem, quæsi iter pergendi ad regulares in Windesem, ibique inventis fratribus Canonicis regulâribus cum Germano meo, hortatu illius inductus sum adire summæ reverentiæ virum magistrum Florentium. Adjunctus tam *devoto* viro, et *devotis* ejus fratribus, quotidie *devotam* eorum conversationem attendi; numquam prius tales homines vidi tam *devotos*. ("Vita Joan. Gronde," c. 1.)

Non decet me inter *Devotos tuos* commemorari. ("De Imit.," lib. iii. c. 52.)

Utinam in te non dormiret perfectus virtutum, qui multa sæpe vidisti exempla *Devotorum*. ("De Imit.," lib. i. c. 18.)

Quando recordor *Devotorum* . . . tunc in me erubescio. ("De Imit.," lib. iv., c. 14.)

Bearing in mind that Thomas à Kempis tells us himself, in his life of John Gronde, that he had been received amongst the Devout of Windesem, that he studied their devout life, which filled him with admiration, the cogency of these several passages becomes nearly irresistible; they constitute a body of cumulative evidence barely distinguishable from demonstration; and it would involve a violation of every principle of sound criticism to reject it.

#### IV.

But there are still more striking arguments drawn by the Bishop of Bruges from the terminology, the phraseology, the linguistic peculiarities of the "Imitation." He has proved its Flemish or German origin, on philological grounds that no after discussion has shaken; and though taken alone they cannot directly prove the authorship of à Kempis, they have an indirect confirmatory power far too important to be neglected, and go to the very quick of internal evidence.

To take the best known, a famous example in the first chapter of the first book of the "Imitation": "Si scires totam Bibliam *exterius* et omnium philosophorum dicta; quid totum prodesset sine charitate Dei et gratia?" Not one single translation has ever been able to give the literal, etymological force of *exterius* except the Flemish and German. The Flemish stands: "Al wist gy geheel de Schriftuer en alle de spreken der wysgeren *van buiten*, waartoe zou dit alles u dienstig zyn, zonder de genade en de liefde Gods?"\* Even if you should know the whole Bible *outwardly*—that is to say, by heart; for to know by heart in Flemish is rendered by to know *van buiten*, outwardly. But lest any one should take exception to this trans-

\* Vier boeken van de navolging Christi, uit het latyn in't nederduitsch gesteld, door J. David, Brussel, 1844.

lation, as being a late one, and consequently open to suspicion, we will turn to the old Dutch edition of the "Imitation," printed at Antwerp, in 1505, by Henric Eckert van Homberch, of which there are two fine copies in the British Museum. The passage is here rendered: "Of stu connes di ganse bybele *van buyten* en alle die leer der heydenscher meesters," &c. There is no mistaking the literalness of the old rendering, as there is no gainsaying the idiomatic character of the modern and the peculiar connection of the Latin *exterius* with both. Next, taking up the German translation of Guido Görres, published in 1839, *exterius* reappears in *auswendig*, the idiomatic value of which is also unimpeachable. But what Frenchman or Italian would try to force an essentially Flemish idiom into his Latin composition to spoil the purity of his style? It is true that P. Mella holds that *to know outwardly* is an expression borrowed from the Lombard dialect, and used throughout Northern Italy, especially at Verona, where a school child, he asserts, will say "*saper da fuori*" when he can repeat his lesson without the aid of a book; but, as Canon Delvigne appositely remarks, a *patois* is not a real language. At any rate, Italian translators have not considered it such; and when the urchins of certain quarters of Brussels say, as they do say, "*M. le Curé, puis-je faire ma première Communion, quand je sais tout mon catechisme dehors?*" they may offer an interesting study to the philologist enamoured of curious survivals, but they do not speak French. No, we can yet say with Mgr. Malou, French and Italian translators have not understood the expression, "*Si scires totam Biblam exterius;*" the greater number, including P. Mella himself, have passed it over without attempting to give even an equivalent for it; and only in a Teutonic language can it be used in a strict etymologic sense. Literally translated, and used by a Fleming, it is clear, precise, and elegant: in French and Italian it is senseless.\*

Again, to regard an event with indifference, is rendered in good Flemish by, to regard it with an equal countenance: the author of the "Imitation" says (lib. iii. cap. 25): "*Ita ut una aequali facie in gratiarum actiones permanes inter prospera et contraria:*" literally in Flemish, "*Met een gelyk aengerzicht;*" or, to quote from the old Dutch version, "*Met eenō ghēlijckō aensicht.*" The best foreign translators have failed to render the expression. M. de Lamennais translates: "*Regardant du même oeil.*" P. Cesari: "*Con uno stesso viso tu perseveri.*" Both are wide of the

\* On this peculiar use of *exterius* Du Cange remarks: *Exterius Discere*, pro Memoriter discere scripsit Buschius . . . germ. *Auswendig lernen*. Occurrit passim in Lib de Imitat. Chr. Scire *Exterius*. Locutio Belgica, ut observat. D. Falconet, *van Buyten leeren*.

accuracy of the quaint Flemish, which to the very letter gives the Latin text, which, in turn, manifestly derives its picturesque impressiveness from a Teutonic source. This same notion of indifference is expressed in polished Flemish by: "Ik val daer niet op," literally, "*I do not fall upon that*;" but meaning, "I don't care about it." The idiom occurs in the ninth chapter of the second book of the "Imitation": "Verus amator Christi et studiosus sectator virtutum *non cadit super consolationes*." The Flemish translator gives it *verbatim*: "De ware minnaer van Jesus *valt op geene vertroosting*en." M. de Lamennais and P. Cesari have both failed to give not merely the actual words, but the meaning of the passage. The one translates: "Celui qui a vraiment l'amour de Jésus-Christ *ne cède pas à l'attrait des consolations*;" the other, "L'amator vero di Cristo *non s'abbandona alle consolazioni*."

Finally, not to tire with illustrations that are far from being exhausted, the idea expressive of everything being dependent on one thing is conveyed in Flemish equally by the verbs *to lie* and *to stand*. The author of the "Imitation" (lib. ii., cap. 12) says: "Ecce in cruce *totum constat*, et in moriendo *totum jacet*." The Flemish gives the words as well as reflects the meaning: "*Alles bestaet dan in het kruis, en in het sterven ligt alles*." The French and Italian, on the other hand, give the words: "Ainsi tout *est dans la croix et consiste à mourir*; Ecco che nella croce *sta tutto, a tutto nel morire è riposto*." And even granting that *sta* is not here used in a forced sense, the antithesis of the *stare* and *jacere* which the Flemish preserves, has entirely disappeared.

We have chosen these examples from out of many others because they are so simple, so clear, so easy, that the merest tyro in French and Italian cannot fail to see how impossible it would be for any one thinking in either language, as in his mother tongue, and writing in Latin, to make use of expressions so foreign to them and so far removed from pure Latinity as almost to constitute a language apart.\* And for those who are not masters of the niceties of the Flemish tongue, it would surely be no great tax on their faith to accept the word of a man of honour, a man distinguished in the Church and in Letters, that the most striking peculiarities of the phraseology of the "Imitation" are literal renderings of the classic idioms of his native tongue. But even this is not necessary; for whoever, ignorant

---

\* "Le style de 'l'Imitation' n'est pas latin sans doute, mais il est plein de charme. C'est une langue à part qu'il faut prendre pour ce qu'elle est, très-peu classique, mais admirablement propre à rendre les nuances les plus fines de la vie intérieure et du sentiment." *Etudes d'Histoire Religieuse*. Par Ernest Renan. Paris, 1858.

of the language though he be, will take the trouble to refer to a good Flemish dictionary, he will be able at once to verify for himself the accuracy of Mgr. Malou's statements, to appreciate in a great measure the value of the examples cited, and to realize with facility that "they are not vague, insignificant words—words common to many languages, trivial terms, vulgar phrases—but idioms properly so called, expressions so essentially Flemish that they are foreign to every other tongue, and really untranslatable." If, as Mgr. Malou remarks, they were common also to the French and Italian languages, the accomplished men who have translated the "*Imitation*" would have seized the sense of such expressions perfectly, and have easily rendered it by analogous terms. We have said sufficient to show that they have failed to do so from the earliest down to the latest, and that the Flemish translator alone has been able to render faithfully and substantially the phrases that in the book of the "*Imitation*" diverge the most sensibly from the genius of the Latin tongue. It is a fact that compels our assent, lacking even other proofs. The author of the "*Imitation*" was neither a Frenchman nor an Italian; he belonged to the country that gave birth to the Congregation of Modern Devotion; and he thought in a language foreign to Gersen and Gerson alike. Intrinsic evidence is a stubborn thing; it cannot be tampered with; it cannot be repressed.

## V.

In his interesting preface to the facsimile of the autograph manuscript that heads our present Article, M. Ruelens draws attention to a very important feature of the Codex, which, if it has not escaped their notice, has at least been disregarded by skilled paleographers, such as Mabillon, Silvestre de Sacy, and Arndt, who nevertheless have reproduced it in the paleographic illustrations of their different works. We allude to the peculiar system of punctuation discovered by Dr. Hirsche.

The history of punctuation in the Middle Ages has been hitherto very little investigated. We are, Dr. Hirsche says, standing at the very beginning of the investigation. And, indeed, the punctuation of manuscripts is one of the most thorny questions in paleography. It is impossible to reduce it to any definite system. The signs for the division of sentences were limited in number, but scribes seem to have used them pretty much according to their fancy. Each copyist, or rather each school of copyists, appears to have had its own rules. The Brothers of Common Life and the Canons of St. Augustin, who, as we have seen, received into their Order most of the early disciples of Gerard Groote, used greater method in their tran-

scriptions than almost any other body of copyists. They were emphatically "fratres de penna"—that is, copyists of books of education and of piety. Both these kinds of works required particular care, especially the latter, which were destined for religious houses of ascetic or contemplative orders, and were read publicly to the community in the refectory or at chapter. To win the attention and fix his lessons in the memory of his hearers, it was the first aim of the trained Lector\* to read with art and unction; and it was in order to help him to the attainment of this end that authors strove to give their writings an attractive form, a mnemonic form, so to say. They made them melodious, rhythmical, and introduced into them characteristic assonances that haunted the memory like the aria of an oratorio; "de là ces propositions où la rime flatte l'oreille et le rythme berce la pensée." And these phrases, these harmonious periods, were indicated to the reader of the Community by careful pointing, so that no pains were spared to ensure the perfection of a most impressive style, which, in short, became a sort of spoken music. This mode of reading to assemblies of men prevailed generally in the Low Countries, and belongs to the genius of the Flemish people. Their early writers in prose and verse used and abused assonances and rhymes without limit. The *Refereinen* of their rhetoricians from the fifteenth century are literally crammed with them; and they are all methodically divided, measured by a particular sign, a double bar, for the guidance of the reader. And at the present day in the various halls of rhetoric that still exist in the Flemish provinces of Belgium, poetry is read with an emphasis *sui generis*, the echo of old traditions.

Now, when Dr. Karl Hirsche was studying Thomas à Kempis's 1441 autograph manuscript of the "Imitation" for his critical edition, he discovered in it paleographical peculiarities comprehending a perfect system of punctuation such as he had never met with before. Continuing his search, he found the same system used in the other undoubted works of à Kempis, giving them an altogether unique, individual character; for though a more extended search showed that the system was used in the Middle Ages, this was very rarely the case, and even then almost exclusively by the Brothers of Common Life, amongst whose works and copies of works

---

\* The office of Reader (Lector) was an important one: monks were carefully trained to fill it; and they were distinguished according to the greater or less skill they displayed in their calling, which is often alluded to in the obituaries of monastic institutions. "Fuit bonus lector," or "fuit bonus cantor," frequently constitutes the simple biography of a departed brother.



it is far from common, whereas in all the manuscript copies of the indisputably genuine works of Thomas à Kempis, written by his own hand, it is the sole system that, with a perfection not found elsewhere, prevails. Nevertheless, we are far from asserting Thomas à Kempis to have been the inventor of the system.\* Dr. Hirsche has found it in a manuscript of the Vulgate, of the undoubted date 1315, and in a Carthusian breviary printed in Paris in 1643; and one of its peculiar marks, the clivis, is likewise to be found in Benedictine and Cistercian breviaries, printed respectively in 1518 and 1617.† But this in no degree militates against the fact that Thomas à Kempis, scrupulously following the precept of his master,‡ carried the system to perfection; and that in his works generally, and in the "Imitation" specially, he used it with a point, a force, a minuteness not hitherto met with elsewhere. And hence it merits the most careful attention, not only from its interest in connection with the authorship of the "Imitation," but also on account of its bearing on the history of punctuation in the Middle Ages.

The punctuation of Thomas à Kempis is above all rhetorical, as distinguished from grammatical; and used in conjunction with periods of the most perfect rhythm, and sentences balanced and rounded with assonances and rhymes of varying delicacy and strength, was calculated, whilst indicating to the readers of his day the pauses necessary to be observed, to lead them almost involuntarily to recite a "sentence in accordance with intention of the author, and to give it that effect, that cadence, that charm which speech requires to make it penetrate into the hearer's soul"—"dulcis, durabilis, clara, pura, secans aëra et auribus sedens."

In discovering this, Dr. Hirsche has furnished us with a key to the rare literary charm of the "Imitation," and a fresh means of interpreting the deep significance of the book that

\* "Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe der *Imitatio Christi* nach dem Autograph des Thomas von Kempen." Von Karl Hirsche. Berlin, 1873.

† Silvestre, in his "Paléographie Universelle," gives a facsimile page of Clement VII.'s Bible, where the clivis occurs once. Mr. Maunde Thompson has kindly had many of the MSS. in the British Museum, belonging to the XIV. century, and to the time of Thomas à Kempis, searched for traces of this punctuation, and at last he has found the clivis in a fine Italian MS. of the Vulgate of about the same date as that of Clement VII.

‡ "Quidquid est pro communi bono, sollicitè custodire debemus sicut sacra vasa altaris. Libri sacre scripturæ custodiendi sunt tanquam verissimus thesaurus Ecclesiæ. In scriptura non solum querere debemus nos, scilicet ut bene scribamus, sed etiam utilitatem communis boni, ut libri sint correcti et bene *compunctuati* et distincti." (Epistola D. Florentii ad quondam regularem in Windesheim. Th. à K. Opera, ed. H. Sommalina. S. J. Colon, 1759.)

from youth to old age seemed ever new to the great Bellarmine. *De Script. Eccl.\**

Modern punctuation is occupied pre-eminently with the logical sequence, the bare literal sense of sentences, and the limits of propositions contained in them: the punctuation of Thomas à Kempis so far surpasses it, that it reveals the very spirit of the writer, and discloses the feelings that swayed him, as he wrote the terse, penetrating, piercing sentences that for nigh five hundred years have been the cherished maxims of saints and sinners; thrilling the hearts of men and women wearied with the stress of life, and fascinating the cultivated intellect of sceptics and unbelievers; at one time drawing out with new force the clear note of courage, the "*sta firmiter*," "*esto robustus*," "*cessa conqueri*," that, like the "*viriliter age*" of the Royal Psalmist, is never altogether absent from even the tenderest passages; now marking the striking antitheses that bring straight home to the mind of each one the anomalies of human nature and human life; or falling in with rhythmical movements of hope or despondency, grief and supplication, that baffle description, and are sought for elsewhere in vain.

All the editions of the "*Imitation*" now in general use consist for the most part of four books, divided into chapters, which chapters are again divided into paragraphs; and, in many instances, but not invariably, the paragraphs are sub-divided into versicles. The paragraphs were first introduced into the text in 1599, by Henry Sommalius, the Jesuit, and his paragraphs, almost unchanged, have passed into all the editions of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries: in the seventeenth century several editors began to add versicles to the paragraphs of Sommalius. Both paragraphs and versicles are extremely defective, and tend to obscure rather than to elucidate the text, by separating kindred passages that naturally cohere, and approximating others that sensibly diverge. Nor is the punctuation to which we are accustomed, and which is likewise, for the most part, due to Sommalius, any more satisfactory. The remedy for all these defects, however, lies in the Antwerp codex. In the first place, Thomas à Kempis there supplies us with a double indication of the main division of chapters he intended to be observed: frequently the heading of the chapter shows it. The first chapter of the first book, for instance, consists of two chief parts that are simply an amplification of the twofold title—"De imitatione

\* "*Opusculum sane utillissimum est, ac jure in tota Ecclesia summo omnium consensu receptum, et frequentatum, et in omnes pene linguas conversum. Ego certe ab adolescentia, et usque in senectam hoc opusculum saepissime volvi, et revolvi, et semper mihi novum apparuit, et nunc etiam mirifice cordi meo sapit.*"

Christi et contemptu omnium vanitatum mundi." Again, the ninth chapter of the first book, like the title, "De pace acqui-  
renda et zelo proficiendi," is also divided into two parts. The other indication is the letter C, and occasionally the corruption of the Greek Π, which, placed at intervals in the context, clearly marks the line of argument and the chief points of a chapter.

But it is the punctuation, strictly so called, of Thomas à Kempis with which we are mainly concerned here. This, as we remarked just now, is essentially rhetorical, as distinguished from grammatical, and it indicated *pauses of greater or shorter duration to be observed in reading, and nothing else*. Such, at least, is the conclusion of Dr. Hirsche, after prolonged study of the question, extending over many years. Thomas à Kempis never makes use of the note of exclamation in the "Imitation:" he uses a note of interrogation common to the Middle Ages (⁂) and four distinct stops. 1st, The punctum or full stop (.), followed by a small letter to indicate a brief pause; 2ndly, the colon (:), to indicate a pause of longer duration; 3rdly, the *clivis* or *flewa* (⁂), resembling in form the old sign of that name belonging to the neumes of early musical notation, denoting a pause of still longer duration; 4thly, the full stop (.), followed by a capital letter, denoting the longest pause of all. This peculiar use of the clivis in conjunction with the note of interrogation, so exactly like in appearance the "podatus"—its companion in the musical notation of ancient times—as to seem identical with the twelfth century examples of it given by Coussemaker in his scholarly work on the harmony of the Middle Ages,\* is very suggestive. And coupled with the fact that the four books of the "Imitation" are called *Musica Ecclesiastica*† in several of the early manuscripts, espe-

\* Planches, xx., xxi., Histoire de l'Harmonie au moyen âge. Paris, 1852.

† The beautifully written fifteenth century manuscript containing the first three books of the "Imitation" in the Lambeth Palace Library (No. 536) has the following title:—Hic est libellus qui vocatur musica ecclesiastica omnibus in virtute perficere cupientibus valde necessaria et dividitur in tres partes. The colophon is: Explicit liber interne consolationis id est tertia pars libri musice ecclesiastice. In the British Museum (Royal Collection, No. 7, B. viii.) there is a French MS. belonging to the first half of the fifteenth century still more interesting than the Lambeth MS. The whole of the first page is filled with an illumination representing a Pope playing on an organ, the bellows of which are blown by a Cardinal. Behind the Pope stand an Archbishop and a Bishop, the former holding an archiepiscopal cross, the latter a pastoral staff and a book (from which both are singing). The codex has no general title, but the first of the three books commences: Incipit liber interne consolacionis qui vocatur musica ecclesiastica. Et dividitur in tres partes principales. The colophon repeats the title: Explicit tertia et ultima pars libri interne consolatione: qui vocatur musica ecclesiastica.

cially those belonging to England, it almost inevitably gives rise to the presumption that the resemblance of the rhetorical to the musical signs is something more than accidental, that there is an analogy *intus* as well as *extra* between them, and that, serving a more extended purpose than the simple marking of a pause, the clivis of Thomas à Kempis retained its musical significance, and necessitated a fall of the voice, as the note of interrogation, the "podatus," unquestionably indicated a rise. We drew Dr. Hirsche's attention to the matter; he carefully tested the hypothesis; but his previous conviction that all the stops indicated solely different gradations of rest remained unchanged, and he proved with great clearness that the same inflexion and emphasis and accentuation of voice are not by any means invariably associated with the same signs. So that, though the interpunctuation of à Kempis assisted greatly to indicate the inflexion of voice to be observed in recitation, it did so indirectly—*i.e.*, by primarily marking pauses, the due observance of which elicited the thought of the author, the real guide on this point of the reader, who was, moreover, greatly assisted by the rhythmical flow of the words which would insensibly carry him on a long way to a correct interpretation, independently of any capital, or clivis, or colon, or stop warning him, by the degree of impressiveness attached to it, of the spirit of the text. Only a few illustrations are necessary to make this evident. We shall follow Dr. Hirsche's arrangement of the text, because it shows at a glance the metrical character\* of the "Imitation," as well as the distinctive value of the stops:—

Vanitas vanitatum et omnia vanitas :

25 præter amare Deum et illi soli servire.

Ista est summa sapientia :

per contemptum mundi tendere ad regna cœlestia.

Vanitas igitur est divitias perituras querere :

et in illis sperare.

30 Vanitas quoque est honores ambire :

et in altum statum se extollere.

---

\* The metrical character of Thomas à Kempis's undisputed works is so generally acknowledged, that M. Tamizey de Larroque urges the absence of it from the "Imitation" as a proof that Thomas was not the author of it. "Une des grandes préoccupations dont on ne trouve pas la moindre trace dans 'l'Imitation,' et la réunion, à la fin de ses phrases, des mots sont l'*assonance* (italique de M. Tamizey) puisse flatter l'oreille. Nul écrivain n'a été possédé à un aussi haut degré de la manie de faire de la prose rimée. En agitant même les questions les plus graves, le sous-prieur du Sainte Agnès cherche encore à obtenir un agréable effet musical. (Récentes Recherches) Surely it was high time for Adrien de But to tell us about the "volumen metricæ super illud : *qui sequitur me.*"

Vanitas est carnis desideria sequi :

et illud desiderare unde postmodum graviter oportet puniri.

Lib. i. cap. 1.

Here we have two kinds of stop. The full stop, since it is followed by a capital letter, denotes the longest pause ; the colon a rest of shorter duration. Neither indicates directly the modulation of voice to be observed. It is the sense of the words that mainly shows there must not be a fall of the voice at the colon, for, though an impressive pause is claimed, the sentence is not finished ; and it is the sense of the words that shows a fall of the voice as well as a longer rest, where the longest pause occurs.

Et dixi.

Beatus quem tu erudieris Domine :

et de lege tua docueris eum.—Lib. iii. cap. 3.

In these lines we have two pauses of longest duration, the one after *dixi*, the other after *eum*. But in reciting *dixi* the voice must be sustained ; at *eum* it should fall, as is manifest by the sense. Yet what better calculated to recall a wandering attention, and fix it on the words of the Royal Psalmist, than the long pause after the sharp *dixi* ?

Again :—

Age age nunc carissime quid quid agere potes ❶

Quia nescis quando morieris :

nescis etiam quid tibi post mortem sequetur.—Lib. i. cap. 23.

Here we have three signs indicating three different degrees of rest. The reason of the clivis after *potes* is obvious : the first verse bears to the two following verses a relation quite different from that which these bear to one another : it is further removed from them in sense than they are removed from each other, and consequently they are separated by the briefer, though impressive, colon. But the passage that immediately precedes and leads up to these verses is so striking in the examples it offers of the beauty of this rhetorical punctuation that I have no hesitation in citing it at length, taking care, whilst closely adhering to the pointing of à Kempis, still to follow the disposition of Dr. Hirsche :—

Ah stulte quid cogitas te diu victurum ❷  
quum nullum diem habeas securum ❸

90 Quam multi decepti sunt :

et insperate de corpore extracti.

Quoties audisti a dicentibus.

quia ille gladio cecidit ❹

ille submersus est :

95 ille ab alto ruens cervicem fregit :

- ille manducando obrigit.  
 ille ludendo finem fecit :  
 alius igne.  
 alius ferro.  
 100 alius peste.  
 alius latrocinio interiit ❧  
 et sic omnium finis mors est :  
 et vita hominum tamquam umbra subito pertransit.  
 Quis memorabitur tui post mortem ❧  
 105 et quis orabit pro te ❧

Age age nunc carissime quid quid agere potes ❧  
 Quia nescis quando morieris :  
 nescis etiam quid tibi post mortem sequetur.

It would be impossible to discriminate with greater nicety between the various forms of sudden death, and at the same time to mark their inter-resemblance. Violent death at the hand of the assassin is further removed from the two sorts of accidental death that follow than these are removed from one another ; again, how much closer still is the connection between those that succeed ; then, how marvellously the momentum of the passage is increased by the rapid enumeration of the several kinds of death that sweep away multitudes at once—fire, war, pestilence, accompanied, as they ever are, by the outrages of the plunderer—after which it sensibly diminishes in preparation for the pathetic simile of the 103rd line ; but only to be accelerated again in the vigorous, impetuous “age age nunc carissime quid quid agere potes ❧,” where the absence of the commas of modern punctuation, which would only impede the speed of the movement, marks the swiftness with which the reader is to pass from word to word, and images with wonderful vividness the vehemence that stirred the writer as he gave utterance to the deep thoughts within him.

The next is a beautiful instance of graceful rhyme, as well as rhetorical punctuation :—

- Nihil dulcius est amore ❧  
 nihil fortius.  
 nihil altius nihil latius :  
 40 nihil jucundius nihil plenius nec melius in cœlo et in terra ❧  
 quia amor ex Deo natus est :  
 nec potest nisi in Deo super omnia creatura quiescere.  
 Amans volat currit et lætatur ❧  
 liber est et non tenetur.  
 45 Dat omnia pro omnibus :  
 et habet omnia in omnibus ❧  
 quia in uno summo super omnia quiescit :  
 ex quo omne bonum fluit et procedit.



Non respicit ad dona :  
50 sed ad donantem se convertit super omnia bona.

Lib. iii. cap. 5.

But a still more admirable instance of the power of representing the various changes in the swiftness of the writer's thoughts, the flow of affections, of feeling, occurs in the fourth chapter of the fourth book, where, moreover, the punctuation is made to give effect to one of those passages of psychological observation with which the "Imitation" abounds:—

Ego quidem laboro in sudore vultus mei.  
dolore cordis torqueor :  
peccatis oneror.  
tentationibus inquietor  
multis malis passionibus implicor et premor :  
et non est qui adjuvet.  
non est qui liberet et salvum faciat.  
nisi tu Domine Deus Salvator meus  
cui committo me et omnia mea :  
ut me custodias et perducas in vitam æternam.

And here we must end. In a little while the long-promised memorials of the Congregation of Windesem will disclose all that history and tradition can tell us about the Monk of St. Agnes; and then we in England shall be able to realize more fully how Thomas à Kempis, the disciple of Gerard Groote and the most winning exponent of the great master's teaching, stands revealed to his countrymen in the "Imitation of Christ."

---

ART. VI.—THE LETTERS OF CHARLES DICKENS.

*The Letters of Charles Dickens.* Edited by his SISTER-IN-LAW  
and ELDEST DAUGHTER. London : Chapman and Hall.  
1880.

**A**MONG the tens of thousands who have read, known, and formed an intelligent judgment upon the novels of Charles Dickens, there are many different attitudes of mind with regard to the novelist himself. There are those who look back upon him with an admiration amounting to personal regard; they feel with answering sympathy what was expressed by Jeffrey, "the Critic-Laureate"—that in the magic of his success his heart was his talisman. There are others who think of him as a social reformer; leaving out of account his precise theories, they take Carlyle's superlative praise of him, and endorse its blunt force and its capitals—"He was an Honest Man."

Others, again—and they are the most numerous class—have appreciated his buoyant, hearty humour above everything else; they own a kindly liking for the man who left this hard-worked world so rich a legacy of laughter. And there are multitudes who, yielding warm praise to his inimitable work, find their enthusiasm tempered by a sense of the defects and mistakes into which he was led by his very popularity. They have their points of difference from him, but they have far more points of contact with his mind and heart; they relish his wit and enjoy his company through the medium of those imaginary beings with which he peopled the well-known world; they have a tender memory for the one great reality—the human life of him who first suffered and then sought far to win the experience bound up in all those unreal lives; who gathered and invented them, laboriously wrought them out, enjoyed and realised them as they were never enjoyed and realised even by his most fiction-blinded reader. There are others who criticise for criticism's sake, and make a point of being at variance with the vulgar vote; they are of a different order from the critics who refuse to count his work the best of its kind; they go farther, and declare it to be entirely a delusion, and his success nothing better than a literary sleight-of-hand trick, which placed the man himself in a false position with regard to the crowd that worshipped him. In answer to all such sweeping condemnation we can only say, that to have spoken to the crowd, to have given to the masses a fund of genial thought and innocent mirth, is a grander thing than to have pleased the hypercritical few; and if they fail to see this, they have no connection with him whatever, either in praise or dispraise, for he never wrote for those who could sympathise so little with human nature. Lastly, there is another class of readers, whom it is still more difficult to understand. They are those who have followed his stories through hours and days of interest and delight, and yet have no interest whatever in hearing of the writer himself, no sudden attraction of curiosity or sense of gratification when by some chance they come across things that concerned him, or that belonged to him, or that throw a light upon his life and pursuits. In a word, of all the attitudes of intelligent readers towards the most popular of all books of fiction and towards their writer, the one position that we are entirely at a loss to understand is that of the appreciators of the work who are utterly indifferent to its author. When his friend was writing his biography, an American told him that among the snows on the summit of the Sierra Nevada travellers had found a lonely dweller in a hut—a half-wild man, clad in wolf-skin and sacking; he seldom saw a human face, but he beguiled

his time with "Pickwick" and "Nickleby," which he kept in a barrel; and "he did not know, or seem to care, about the author." The persistently indifferent readers remind us of the denizen of the hut. They, too, have the spirit of self-isolation, and they want the common instinct that sends human minds in quest of the kindred origin of any wonderful human work.

But the truth is, that there was never a writer privileged with so wide a personal popularity. One reason may be, because its character was identical with his own, and he reflected his own self in his imaginations. His personality, once revealed, is the counterpart of the reader's conception of him from impersonal knowledge. There is hardly in the history of literature such another case of likeness between an author and his work; unless it be the case of one of that brilliant cluster of poets with whom the century opened, and there the likeness was England's loss and his; while, on the contrary, the similarity between the novelist in, and out of, his works, is a pleasure to his readers and an honour to himself. The second reason why his memory is linked with his fancies, is simply because it is a memory well known, and now wonderfully perpetuated in one of the most graphic biographies ever written. If Dickens had not been one of the most remarkable men of his time, his life would still have been worth placing on record; for it was as great a romance, and as full of silent suggestion, as anything he ever wrote. There are deeper things untold than told in that biography, written partly by his friend of thirty-three years, partly by his own unconscious hand; and the whole discloses a life as a life can seldom be disclosed. Every human history is wonderful; but private lives are for the most part sealed wonders. Here there is a seal broken, for his fame, for our gratification. And if, as was said by one\* who knew humanity in its sole true aspect, "there is no poem in the world like a man's life," we may well be drawn with the highest motives to the study of a personal history at once so fully revealed, so strange in itself, and having for its subject a human unit so attractive to the rest. "A man's real life," it was well written, "is at once a bolder and a simpler thing than the creation of the poet. It is like a grand, heavenly recitative, which Providence itself pronounces as the years go on; from one point of view inventive as the improvisatore, from another, merely interpreting the waywardness of a man's own will." There is before us an addition to the revelation of a life already most singular in its fulness. Let the spirit of this high view haunt us; not that we would miss for a moment the contagion

\* F. Faber.—"There is but one view of things which is true, and that is God's view of them."

of our humorist's pleasantry, or take an overshadowed survey of what was pre-eminently bright and genial; but we would bear in mind that there is a still unchanging background across which the central figure moves; it is the background of immutable truth, against which the whole world shows its shape.

We have said that the most popular of English novelists had in his own story as great a romance as anything he ever wrote. The "queer small boy" on the Kentish Road, wondering to hear his father say he might yet live at Gad's Hill if he worked hard—what does this remind us of, but that strangest episode of boyhood, the child of fallen fortunes lying by the Daylesford stream, thrilled with his first dream of ambition? But with the boy, Charles Dickens, there was not the ambition of power or wealth, but the hope of being "a learned and distinguished man;" and he himself has told us what misery the fading of that hope cost him in the hardest period of his early days. In that touching page of his life, we watch the "queer small boy," delicately sensitive, and helpless in his self-dependence, deep in daily drudgery at the warehouse window in Chandos Street, or with empty pockets taking a turn in Covent Garden Market, and staring at the pineapples, or going homeward in the twilight through the double current of wayfarers on Blackfriars Bridge. Who has not wondered at the connection between that story and the sequel—the boy passing from a common-place school to a lawyer's office, thence by his own exertion to the first place in the reporters' gallery at Westminster, and from that by one bold step to the first place in popular literature? We see him visiting America, to make through the States a progress likened to that of Lafayette; returning home to reap new success, sometimes mixed with partial failure, sometimes amazing in its completeness even to himself; next visiting France, Italy, Switzerland, to gratify every wish prompted by restless genius or by natural refinement; then setting forth on a new path, with the dramatic readings, and, urged by their success at home, crossing the Atlantic once more to live in an atmosphere of fame and flattery, such as few men's better nature could survive; lastly coming back in the height of his triumph only to sink suddenly amid such universal regret as never followed the death of any writer. This was in outline the romance of reality, that ended under the grey stone in the Abbey. It is easy to trace in such a career the source of his characteristic sympathy with every form of labour, suffering, and need; his determination to see and show the best side even of the roughness and oddities of the less fortune-favoured classes; his interest in the simplest and most homely concerns of every-day life. We can trace, too, the self-reliant,

ever-confident energy which was necessary to his success, but which, in achieving that success so completely, was but too apt to degenerate into a rash self-confidence and a fierce strength of resolution. And in his possession of unfailing animal spirits and overflowing humour, we recognise the gifts that helped him through his early trials, and still more we perceive there a condition of mind which is not unfrequent when a strong and ardent nature has felt life's burdens heavily and very soon, and in their lightening has risen up by the elasticity of youth to enjoy with a sense of childlike freshness the beginning of life's happier chances. That remarkable character, and the career that half formed it, and half was formed by it, are nowhere so wonderfully illustrated as in his own letters. His biographer gave his view of him, and it guided the world's opinion; but his own view of his own life is of greater interest than either that of Mr. Forster or of the critical world at large. That view may be found, written as the years went by, in the letters now published to form a supplement to the well-known biography.

Some objectors will declare that the canons of good letter writing, according to the Macaulay, Gray, and Cowper style, are not observed here; that the letters do not deal largely in description, or discourse often on subjects of general and abiding interest; that few other eminent lives are illustrated by them; that they are filled with bygone trivialities, and savour of egotism. There is ground for some of these objections, but it is narrow ground. The days are gone when there was an art that ought to have been called by the heavy name of epistolary composition. Sir Rowland Hill did a good deal to give it the *coup de grace*; and there is no shadow of the dead art here, though some of the letters were written before modern facilities for letter writing created the newer and better art of written speech. Nor would anyone come to the letters of Charles Dickens for Sevigné or Walpole compositions; nor, turning to a nearer time, ought anyone seek here depth such as that of Macaulay or Wilberforce, or thoughtfulness like that of the novelist's own friend, Jeffrey. His letters are simply like himself, and it is known beforehand that he was essentially different from all these types of mind. All we want him to illustrate is, not the men and things and social state of his time, which is our own time still, but his own self, since he is here no longer. And nothing illustrates a life so well as its smallest incidents; just as it is from lines, and shades, and distinctions inappreciably little, that every face takes its individuality. Such letters as these are a character-sketch and life-sketch of himself, drawn by the man's own hand; and their interest is

of far greater degree, but the same in kind, as that attaching to a portrait. Viewed in this light there is no egotism in the letters except that which is legitimate in all letter-writing, and, perhaps, in that alone. And since it is true that when Dickens conversed with most life, and heart, and brilliance, there was but little for listeners to bring away, no fault need ever again be found with his biographer for not letting readers have a chance of hearing him talk as Johnson talked through Boswell.

The letters are arranged in order of time, with a brief and excellently terse explanation, entitled "Narrative," before each period. Instead of glancing at them in their order in the two volumes, it may be of interest to look at their fourfold revelation of the writer:—in his home circle and in his personal experiences; as an author; as a public reader; and in the mission he assumed as a social reformer.

In telling little incidents or speaking of matters concerning only the near relatives addressed, there is in the letters a hearty colloquial style, and they catch from it some of his own wonderful vivacity. His very modes of address reflect his own leaning towards all things playful or ludicrous. The artist, Mr. Cattermole, one of his first illustrators, at times becomes "Kittenmoles." Stanfield, the sea-painter—a friend unsurpassed in his esteem—is generally known as "Stanny," and is once saluted in a nautical letter with "Yoho! old Salt;" while the veteran actor Macready, whom Dickens had first seen as a boy, is addressed by the Dickens of after years both as "my dear old Parr," and solemnly as "Young Man!" As for the names bestowed on his home-circle, even those familiar with child-names in his novels will not be prepared to find his own children dubbed the Chickenstalker and the Plornishghenter, the latter name, indeed, adhering to its victim until the letter (given by Mr. Forster also) of solemn and kindly advice on parting with his son bound for Australia, began as we find it here, "My dearest Plorn." Anyone who has looked into the published letters of Jeffrey, to the undercurrent beneath their thoughtful seriousness, will be reminded by the Dickens letters of some of his charming glimpses of the home at Craigcrook, and his grandchild, Tarley, studying the pictures with business-like patience, as a lawyer would a code. Perhaps the best thing that shows in this present correspondence is the writer's warm trustful constancy to his friends. The very opposite comes to our mind from the Moore correspondence, in such an instance as his writing to Lady Donegal, that in the long time ere he can see her, he dreads she will care less and less for him every day. With Dickens, his friends of Lausanne were never forgotten; and through years we trace his letters to them,



exulting in friendship with the Watsons of Rockingham, or expressing a yearning to return for another look at the old scenes with those who remained in Switzerland. The amateur theatricals at the house of the Hon. Mr. and Mrs. Watson are the subject of many letters, and some of the most amusing pages in the book are taken up with matters theatrical, whether with the doings of his dramatic club, or with his descriptions of the French-Englishmen who figured in Parisian dramas, or, better still, with his allusions to the Tavistock House plays begun for the Christmas amusement of his children. In the midst of preparations for one of those last-named entertainments he gives an odd glimpse of himself at his literary work; when the house was full of carpenters, painters, gas-fitters, and costume-makers, while Stanfield had been incessantly on top of scaffoldings for the last two months, "and your friend has been writing *Little Dorrit*, &c., &c., in corners, like the Sultan's groom who was turned upside down by the genii." There is something pleasant made out of his very troubles, when Tavistock House first became his, and like all new abodes seemed to be destined never to let the workmen out and its master in. One of his arrangements there was the supplying of book-backs for the empty spaces in the library, and the list of names alone would have shown whose house it was, for he furnished such titles as "*Captain Cook's Life of Savage*," 3 vols.; "*History of the Middling Ages*," 6 vols.; "*Captain Parry's Virtues of Cold Tar*;" "*Kant's Ancient Humbugs*," 10 vols.; "*The Quarrelly Review*," 4 vols.; "*On the Use of Mercury by the Ancient Poets*;" "*Commonplace Book of the Oldest Inhabitant*;" "*King Henry the Eighth's Evidences of Christianity*," 5 vols.; "*Hansard's Guide to Refreshing Sleep*—as many volumes as possible." Domestic arrangements at his last residence, Gad's Hill Place, will be found equally abundant for the gratification of those readers whose personal feeling may magnify them to importance; but there are few who will not feel some little interest in the sad event close before him, when in the last autumn of his life he wrote inviting his then aged friend Macready, and playing triumphantly with his pride in the last and greatest improvement that he only lived to complete—"You are not expected to admire, but there is a conservatory building—be still, my soul!" In many of the letters, which from an ordinary writer would contain nothing but a few commonplace words, there is a quaint turn that shows how good it is not to be content with brief formalities. Thus, inviting Layard, of Nineveh fame, to dine with them at his choice, he is asked casually to come and begin to dig them out some day; and when he has forgotten to thank Professor Owen for

his treatise on "the Gorilla," he writes a characteristic apology—"This is to bear witness to my blushes and repentance. If you knew how much interest it has awakened in me, and how often it has set me a-thinking, you would consider me a more thankless beast than any gorilla that ever lived. But happily you do *not* know, and I am not going to tell you." Still better is his answer in a case where the ordinary form of reply would have been only a friendly note of regret. To a lady who had made the request, explained by the letter, he says:—

After the profoundest cogitation, I come reluctantly to the conclusion, that I do not know that orphan. If you were the lady in want of him, I should certainly offer *myself*. But as you are not, I will not hear of the situation. It is wonderful to think how many charming little people there must be to whom this proposal would be like a revelation from Heaven. Why don't I know one, and come to Kensington, boy in hand, as if I had walked [I wish to God I had] out of a fairy tale! But no, I do *not* know that orphan. He is crying somewhere by himself at this moment. I can't dry his eyes. He is being neglected by some ogress of a nurse. I can't rescue him.

Most people who look through these volumes will seek for some page unmistakably from Charles Dickens, at his best. We commend to them a certain schoolboy picnic on the river, the description of which is the next best thing to having been present; or can there be a doubt that it was the novelist of gay exaggeration who thus sketched September wanderings in London?—

The other day I was in town. In case you should not have heard of the condition of that deserted village, I think it worth mentioning. All the streets of any note were unpaved, mountains high, and all the omnibuses were sliding down alleys and looking into the upper windows of small houses. At eleven o'clock one morning I was positively alone in Bond Street. I went to one of my tailors, and he was at Brighton. A smutty-faced woman, among some gorgeous regimentals half-finished, had not the least idea when he would be back. I went to another of my tailors, and he was in an upper room, with open windows and surrounded by mignonette boxes, playing the piano in the bosom of his family. I went to my hosier's, and two of the least presentable of the "young men" of that elegant establishment were playing at draughts in the back shop. [Likewise I beheld a porter-pot hastily concealed under a Turkish dressing-gown of a golden pattern.] I then went wandering about to look for some ingenious portmanteau, and near the corner of St. James' Street, saw a solitary being sitting in a trunk shop, absorbed in a book, which, on close inspection, I found to be "*Bleak House*." I thought this looked well, and went in. And he really was more interested in seeing me, when he knew who I was, than any face I had seen in any house, every house I knew being occupied by painters, including my own. I went to the Athenæum that same night,

to get my dinner, and it was shut up for repairs. I went home late, and had forgotten the key, and was locked out.

To the same correspondent he wrote in more thoughtful vein, a few words better worth keeping, on hearing of the mental decay of a mutual friend whom both had known years before in Switzerland. The friend is the same Haldimand whose argumentative turns had formed the subject of many a jest and pleasant memory in other letters.

Poor dear Haldimand, I have thought of him so often. That kind of decay is so inexpressibly affecting and piteous to me, that I have no words to express my compassion and sorrow. When I was at Abbotsford, I saw in a vile glass case the last clothes Scott wore. Among them an old white hat, which seemed to be tumbled, and bent, and broken, by the uneasy purposeless wandering hither and thither of his heavy head. It so embodied Lockhart's pathetic description of him, when he tried to write and laid down his pen and cried, that it associated itself in my mind with broken powers and mental weakness from that hour. I fancy Haldimand in such another, going listlessly about that beautiful place; and remembering the happy hours we have passed with him, and his goodness and truth, I think what a dream we live in, until it seems for the moment the saddest dream that ever was dreamed. Pray tell me if you hear more of him. We really loved him.

Among the many revelations of character in the familiar letters, there is one too rare in these days and too pleasing to be passed over. It is his care for his servants. In the hurry and work of his readings in Ireland he found time and had thought for the message, "Tell the servants that I remember them, and hope they will live with us many years." And during his American readings—when there was enthusiasm and flattery enough to have deprived another man not alone of his common sense, but, still sooner, of his unselfishness—the beginning of one of his letters was filled with instructions for the assistance of a former servant, who had long ago left his service, and whose troubles seemed for the moment to have overclouded his own enjoyment of fortune. Other *traits* of character are not revealed unconsciously, but told; for the most part they are those known already by inference. Thus he writes to one of his sons, "I should never have made my success in life if I had been shy of taking pains;" and in all the letters there is nothing more remarkable than the heart-whole energy which he brought to bear upon any work that was to be done, whether it was the getting-up of a Twelfth-Night Play for his children or the writing of a book, the welcome for a friend or the entertainment of thousands. He was right also in noting his power of "accumulating young feelings in short

pauses." And when he felt that he would never rest much while his faculties lasted, he was making a prediction which could not be more true of any man; he accomplished thereby a vast amount of work, but it had a lamentable sequel one June day at Gad's Hill.

As an author, his whole career is illustrated by the letters. At first there are welcome lights thrown upon his early books. He describes scenes minutely for the artists, first from *Nell* and *Barnaby Rudge*, and afterwards from many another book of his, each scene having evidently in his mind vivid detail enough to justify his boast, that even when he was on the Continent, writing "*Dombey*," he could see every step in the staircase of the Wooden Midshipman, and every bed in the dormitory at Doctor Blimber's. We have also here an account of his journey into Yorkshire in quest of the Yorkshire schools that his "*Nickleby*" swept away; and there is a gem of a letter to a little boy who wanted poetical justice done in an unpoetical manner to the characters of that story—a desire which Dickens gratified in imagination, reporting the effect to the juvenile "*Respected Sir*," with a captivating relish of the joke. In later days, he snatches time for correspondence, "bobbing up corkwise from a sea of *Hard Times*;" or when he is in Paris, after finishing that novel, he wonders at feeling "used up"—"perhaps because I intended to do nothing in that way for a year, when the idea laid hold of me by the throat in a very violent manner." There, in Paris, he found his fame had arrived before him. Even in the shops his name brought the recognition, "*Mais! je suis honoré et intéressé de voir Monsieur Dick-in. Je lis un des livres de Monsieur tous les jours*"—in the *Moniteur*. Or the man who delivered and unpacked his purchases would discourse of the "*caractères si spirituellement tournées*." "*Cette Madame Tojare*" (*Todgers*) "*ah! qu'elle est drôle et précisément comme une dame que je connais à Calais*." His sight-seeing in the French capital was part of his study as an author; and there, as in London, he was to be found not only among the crowds at popular amusements, but in as many of the dark and out-of-the-way corners of life as he could find. He sought, as possible subjects, the prisons and the guillotine itself, the catacombs under the city, and the Morgue until it gave him the sudden shock of horror which he has commemorated in one of his writings. In London his studies led him over similar ground; and there is a letter here referring to subject-seeking in a proposed night at Bow Street, a sight of the arrivals and a visit to the cells. Nor is there wanting mention of his long night-walks through the London streets, wanderings in which he observed and laid the plan of future

fictions, and when he came, as he himself has told, across the old scenes of a boyish experience sad enough to cause shrinking even in manhood. Far away from the great city, he always kept the longing to devote himself to the one old study—the people—rather than to see new scenes. Thus there is a great deal of his inclination told in a very few words, when he writes home from Naples, giving a more telling hint of the fishermen's language than he could have given of the aspect of their coast itself.

I have got to understand the low life of Naples (among the fishermen and idlers) almost as well as I understand the do. do. of my own country, always excepting the language, which is very peculiar and extremely difficult, and would require a year's constant practice at least. It is no more like Italian than English is to Welsh. And as they don't say half of what they mean, but make a wink or a kick stand for a whole sentence, it's a marvel to me how they comprehend each other.

Reference is often made to his editorship of *Household Words*, and then of its new form, *All the Year Round*. It was only part of his system of doing all things thoroughly, when he gave such care to every number, every article, and every writer in particular, that the labour must have been a prodigious strain even upon such energy as his. His appreciation of the work of others was utterly free from the prejudice traditional among fellow-workers in the same craft; his criticism was at once expert and keen, but kindly; his dispraise substantiated by reasons; his praise warm and generous. In one letter he condemns writing of the Newgate Calendar class as unwholesome for publication in any way; in another he shows that the greatest situations of a novel are described too much as in an index or a playbill, and not with the deeply impressed detail which could not be wanting if they had been witnessed; or, again, he points out the mistake of studied "smartness" in writing, and of effort at brilliant description alone—"Airiness and good spirits are always delightful, and are inseparable from notes of a cheerful trip; but they should sympathise with many things as well as see them in a lively way. It is but a word or touch that expresses this humanity, but without that little embellishment of good nature, there is no such thing as humour." Another wise remark of his, is to the effect that even in the most masterly showing of disagreeable characters, too much of them shown makes the story itself seem to assume their nature, and the reader is apt to feel it disagreeable too. We could wish he himself had acted up to that precept always. The effect produced at last by such characters as Grandfather Smallweed is to make the reader dread their company. His

sudden arrival, borne Guy-Fawkes-like in his chair, causes to the witness of the story more dire dismay than to anyone in the story itself.

Among the letters from Dickens as an editor, is his delighted and amazed recognition of a writer to whom we are bound by closer sympathies than even an admiration for very graceful verse nobly inspired. Adelaide Anne Proctor, wishing not to embarrass him as her friend while she ventured to make him her editor, had sent her first poems under an assumed name. An amusing dialogue between him and his manager shows how they conjectured the drollest absurdities over the office fire. But at last the name was disclosed—the name of the well-known daughter of an old and dear friend, Mr. Proctor, called by the literary world Barry Cornwall. The letter, written immediately by Charles Dickens to the young poetess, acknowledges how the verses had deeply stirred his heart; and then ending with one of his own bright touches, he makes reference to the Watts Charity, with its lodging for “six poor travellers, not being rogues or proctors,” by giving her the blessing of Richard Watts—“though I am afraid you come under both his conditions of exclusion.” It was not often that so pleasant a task as that letter fell to his lot; and in one addressed to Mr. Wills, his manager, we see the opposite extreme of experience, when every contribution is full of blunders, and there is a hard-worked day, upon work which others supposed already well done. He describes the editorial torture—“If my mind could have been materialised, and drawn along all the tops of all the spikes on the outside of the Queen’s Bench prison, it could not have been more agonized.”

We shall not have much to say of him in the third aspect—as a reader; although the letters are copious on that subject, and though, while we do not forget that the readings were chiefly a commercial speculation, we recognise in that part of his life the possession of exceptional gifts and a success legitimate and unique. It is, indeed, a fact to be remembered in looking over these letters, that while his position was sufficient to deceive any man by its enthusiasm of flattery, and to carry him out of himself by its excitement, there was still solid ground for his regarding it as a triumph, and his correspondence would have been unnatural if it had not dealt continually and warmly with the subject which for himself and his intimate friends was first in importance at the time. The small number of his selections for public reading is one of the most wonderful evidences of his habit of doing his best and his best alone, as far as preparation and energy could secure it. The working men of his audience had a large share of his thoughts. He



could hardly do without "the roaring sea of the gallery." Sheffield and Birmingham he enjoyed for that reason; Newcastle he called "rough but tender;" and at Liverpool the workmen in the streets and at the docks caught sight of his well-known face, and came to ask a clasp of his hand. At Edinburgh the culture of his audience gave him pleasure. Canterbury, with its constant attraction for himself and his pen, he called the finest of provincial towns. And at Cambridge he had the highest and lowest of the University before him in one appreciative throng. The Irish letters tell how the stream of people, turned away from the Rotunda doors, met him a mile off as he came out of his hotel; how his men were squeezed against the wall by the excited crowds, the glass of the pay-boxes broken in the crush, and eleven bank notes at once thrust at the hand of the mobbed ticket-seller. We hear him report the order and neatness of the whitewashed cottages, and the picturesque and varied character of the country as he travelled from Dublin to Belfast. There the audience was demonstrative beyond measure, as we find from his report, and the warmth of feeling astonished him. When he read Paul Dombey's death, the men sobbed undisguisedly, shedding tears as freely as the women; and during his comic reading, he wrote, "it was just one roar with me and them; for they made me laugh so that sometimes I *could not* compose my face to go on." Irish voices in the streets stopped him with blessings, and begged a grasp of the readily-given hand, and he learned their unsurpassable word of recognition, "God love your face, sir!" Last, not least, he and his business manager brought home two jaunting cars; and he wrote afterwards to offer a friend the first spill on one of the Kentish roads.

The American reading tour is fully described, the climax of his success as a dramatic reader. The excitement of the people is scarcely to be imagined, and it takes him to describe it. He wrote of Brooklyn:—

The sale of tickets there was an amazing scene. The noble army of speculators are now furnished (this is literally true, and I am quite serious) each man with a straw mattress, a little bag of bread and meat, two blankets and a bottle of whisky. With this outfit, *they lie down in line on the pavement*, the whole night before the tickets are sold, generally taking up their position at about ten. It being severely cold at Brooklyn, they made an immense bonfire in the street—a narrow street of wooden houses!—which the police turned out to extinguish. A general fight then took place, out of which the people farthest off in the line rushed bleeding when they saw a chance of displacing others near the door, and put their mattresses in those places, and then held on by the iron rails. At eight in the morning, Dolby appeared with the tickets in a portmanteau.

From beyond the Atlantic he brought home a rich harvest of treasure. But the long battle against illness and fatigue was the beginning of the end. His last triumphs in England as a reader led nearer towards it; and the gradual deepening of the shadow, his refusal to recognise it, and his sheer energy and joyousness of heart keeping life in full vigour till the last—these are touches of darkness, as saddening as any merely human woes that a dead hand ever left traced not told. It is worthy of note that the high spirits and humour of the man never fade out of the American letters, even when he was threatened with exhaustion or illness. The messages sent home are full of buoyant glee and enjoyment of life, even when he was physically all but prostrate. We give one more extract from what he wrote at this time, not alone because it shows him in his drollest frame of mind, but because it is Dickens at his best, whether it occurred in book or letter. We only preface it by a wish that it had not concerned any religious service whatever; but we take it as he meant it, as describing a humorous situation too good to be lost, the ludicrous consisting, of course, not in what happens, but in how it happens.

One of the most comical spectacles I have ever seen in my life was "church" with a heavy sea on, in the saloon of the Cunard steamer coming out. The officiating minister, an extremely modest young man, was brought in between two big stewards, exactly as if he were coming up to the scratch in a prize-fight. The ship was rolling and pitching so, that the two big stewards had to stop and watch their opportunity of making a dart at the reading desk with their reverend charge, during which pause he held on now by one steward, and now by the other, with the feeblest expression of countenance and no legs whatever. At length they made a dart at the wrong moment, and one steward was immediately beheld alone in the extreme perspective, while the other and the reverend gentleman *held on by the mast* in the middle of the saloon—which the latter embraced with both arms as if it were his wife. All this time the congregation was breaking up into sects, and sliding away; every sect, as in nature, pounding the other sect. And when at last the reverend gentleman had been tumbled into his place, the desk (a loose one put upon the dining table) deserted from the church bodily, and went over to the purser. The scene was so extraordinarily ridiculous, and was made so much more so by the exemplary gravity of all concerned in it, that I was obliged to leave before the service began.

Turning to Charles Dickens seen in a fourth aspect—as a reformer—we find him working out a mission to his discharge of which he attributed the greatest importance. Others flattered him, and he flattered himself; there was exaggeration on

all sides. But for all that he worked a certain amount of good, which would be much more deserving of note if it had not been magnified too much already. In his "Life," Mr. Forster defines briefly the objects of reform which he advocated in his novels, and following him, we may say that the first book exposed prison abuses, "Oliver Twist," parish wrongs; "Nickleby," Yorkshire schools; "Chuzzlewit," hypocritical humbug; "Bleak House," Chancery abuses; "Little Dorrit," administrative incompetence; "Hard Times," politico-economic shortcomings; "Our Mutual Friend," social flunkeyism. In fact, the novelist sprang up to possess not only fame and fortune, but a wide hearing as well; and he began at once to make war upon social evils. Almost always he exaggerated and dragged in caricature, and, as Mr. Ruskin declared of "Hard Times," regretfully, his most serious meaning was discredited thereby. But all the same he fought on, now rash even to foolishness, now powerless and self-deceived, now imagining, and exaggerating, and charging headlong again. There were times when he was another Don Quixote, without the rueful countenance. An American statesman was found to declare that Dickens had done more than all the Parliament together to ameliorate the condition of the English poor. Such absurd laudation ruins itself; but it has been repeated in various modified forms. Perhaps the golden mean will be struck by believing that the success of Charles Dickens in this assumed mission was and is greatly overstated; but that, for the most part, his objects were of the best, and therefore his efforts in themselves were praiseworthy, and the same may be said of his limited degree of success—limited not only in extent, but because others had their share in what he helped to further. The triple weapons he held were his power in fiction, his weekly magazine, with its serious social articles, and lastly, his personal influence. With these three he assailed a numberless host of abuses, from slavery, "that accursed and detested system," down to Chancery, "that den of iniquity;" from public executions to ill-managed prisons; from pauperism and ignorance down to the window tax, which kept out health and instruction by keeping out light; and in one letter (given in his biography) he was as strongly in favour of temperance through improved and orderly homes for the poor, as he was against it unconsciously and unfortunately in his first book. The education of the working classes was seldom in his mind confounded with the unsuitable learning, false ambitions, and consequent social restlessness and political speechifying, which is sometimes supposed to be implied in the education of the people. He was very watchful of their habits of mind, and there is a great deal of study of the men and

thought of their amusement implied in such a chance word as that regarding the Manchester Museum, where he said all was too still after their lives passed among whirling and noisy presences: there should be some motion, even if it were but the life of a fountain. In his idea of a working-men's club, which he gives in a letter to Mr. Ollier to form the subject of an article in *All the Year Round* he takes a far too confident survey of human nature, basing it, of course, upon his usual belief in human nature raising itself. But there is a useful suggestion at the end, when he says the article is "to encourage them to declare to themselves and their fellow working-men that they want social rest and social recreation for themselves and their families; and that these clubs are intended for that laudable and necessary purpose, and do not need educational pretences or flourishes. Do not let them be afraid or ashamed of wanting to be amused or pleased." The very name to which this letter is addressed will indicate in accordance with what views the working classes were to be delivered from all evil. His letter regarding strikes is an example of a plausible but most dangerous theory, with a sufficient modicum of sense to set it afloat, and without enough to balance it in men's minds, or to keep in view the practically bad working of the theory; while the disadvantage of strikes in lessening the actual productive wealth of the country (and therefore of the men themselves) is left out of account altogether:—

I should like Morley to do a Strike article—he wrote—and to work into it the greater part of what is here. But I cannot represent myself as holding the opinion that all strikes among this unhappy class of society, who find it so difficult to get a peaceful hearing, are always necessarily wrong. To open a discussion of the question by saying that the men are "*of course* entirely and painfully in the wrong" surely would be monstrous in any one. Show them to be in the wrong here, but in the name of the eternal heavens show why, upon the merits of this question. Nor can I possibly adopt the representation that these men are wrong, because by throwing themselves out of work, they throw other people, possibly without their consent. If such a principle had anything in it, there could have been no civil war, no raising by Hampden of a troop of horse to the detriment of Buckinghamshire agriculture, no self-sacrifice in the political world. And, O good God, when — treats of the suffering wife and children, can he suppose that these mistaken men don't feel it in the depths of their hearts, and don't honestly and honourably, most devoutly and faithfully, believe that for those very children they are bearing all these miseries now.

The last sentence is as perfect an example as could be, of the sanguine manner in which Dickens was accustomed to generalise and then to believe in human nature because of the

persuasive manner of his own generalisation. There are questions where a respect for experience and a glance at a few statistics are a safer guide than argument that by its style carries off its matter. The one work of reform in which we like Charles Dickens best is far different from these vexed questions. It is one of the saddest signs of our time that between the classes there are gaps so wide that they have been called chasms. The common humanity is there; but the community of merit and virtue, the common capacity for loving, for suffering, for seeking rest and comfort—all this is too often tacitly denied, and each class left to the rancour of holding its own. In the works of Dickens there is much that disposes many an individual mind to throw chance bridges across the chasm between class and class. He loved to find something pleasant under physical disadvantages, something worthy in lowliness, something to make us bear with oddities and to cancel meanness of birth; and in all he wrote there is pictured the gracious justice of a mingling of the classes, such as the real world thinks scarcely consistent with its dignity. This, then, of his teaching, is what comes most to our heart; and there is no picture of him so worthy as that letter telling of his night-walk, where the seven bundles of rags lay homeless in Whitechapel by the workhouse wall; no saying of his so good as that which he ejaculates after the Bleak House scene, where the brick-maker's wife bends over her dead child, and is comforted by the "ugly woman very poorly clothed."—"I think the best side of such people is almost hidden from us. What the poor are to the poor is little known, excepting to themselves and God."

In most published letters of eminent men, there is reason to look for some political opinions worth reflection, or some impression of the events that change the surface of the world, some faithful copy of at least a few details of a stirring time. But there are few who will seek any of this in the letters of Dickens, and the few who may seek have but little to find. In 1846 he was in Switzerland, full of Swiss Radicalism, making shallow observations upon the social state of the Catholic and the Protestant cantons; and, with all his detestation of cant, writing the greatest cant that he could have picked up from the crowd, the politico-religious cant against the "Jesuit-ridden kings below the Alps." In 1848, he was ambitious to call himself the "*Citoyen* Charles Dickens." In 1854 and the two succeeding years the great topic of the Crimean War began to struggle into his letters. "The absorption of the English mind in the war" was at first the object of his complaint and ridicule; but he immediately added, thereby implying the incon-

sistency into which he was led by a habit of leaving out of account the course taken by a theory in resolving itself into practice:—"For all this, it is an indubitable fact, I conceive, that Russia must be stopped, and that the future peace of the world renders the war imperative upon us." If the future peace of the world was involved—and what stronger word could he have risked?—it was surely not without reason that all eyes looked out beyond the narrowing sea-wall, and that vestry politics were out of favour for once. A little later he wrote:—

There is nothing in the present time at once so galling and so alarming to me, as the alienation of the people from their own public affairs. I have no difficulty in understanding it. They have had so little to do with the game through all these years of Parliamentary reform, that they have sullenly laid down their cards, and taken to looking on. The players who are left at the table do not see beyond it, conceive that gain and loss and all the interests of the play are in their hands, and will never be wiser until they, and the table, and the lights, and the money, are all overturned together. And I believe the discontent to be so much the worse for smouldering, instead of blazing openly, that it is extremely like the general mind of France before the breaking out of the first Revolution, and is in danger of being turned by any one of a thousand accidents—a bad harvest—the last strain too much of aristocratic insolence or incapacity—a defeat abroad—a mere chance at home—with such a devil of a conflagration as never has been beheld since.

Here he is generalising again, and risking bold language with more than his accustomed rashness. It was such want of profundity of thought and consistency of views that kept him from the possibility of ever leading men on a purely political question. The evils that knit themselves into one cruel knot in 1789 had no counterpart in the England of 1855; and the country itself, in the essentials of habit and temperament, though a careless look likened it to France, was no more like in nature or possible production than a Kentish hop-ground is like a southern vineyard.

While the Crimean War went on, the feeling of Dickens was divided between "admiration of our valiant men," animosity towards Russia,\* "and something like despair to see how the old cannon-smoke and blood-mists obscure the wrongs and sufferings of the people at home." The last idea was predominant with him; and in like manner, looking above all things to

---

\* Political motives led him to publish at that time the history of the Polish nuns of Minsk under the Czar Nicholas, told according to the experience of the sole survivor, the Abbess Makrena—a narrative of Catholic suffering and constancy, never to be forgotten by anyone who has read it. See *Household Words*, May 13th, 1854.



English interest, when he referred to the Jamaica insurrection and the terrible suppression which still many an Englishman shudders to remember, he was betrayed into declaring himself driven stark wild by "platform sympathy with the black—or the native or the devil—afar off. . . . Only the other day there was a meeting of jawbones of asses at Manchester, to censure the Jamaica Governor for his manner of putting down the insurrection! So we are badgered about New Zealanders and Hottentots, as if they were identical with men in clean shirts at Camberwell, and were to be bound by pen and ink accordingly." His ultra-Liberalism is, of course, everywhere apparent in treating of Home affairs, but there are many independent of party who will see some grain of truth in his protest against "our ignorance of what is going on under our Government. What will future generations think of that enormous Indian mutiny being ripened without suspicion until whole regiments arose and killed their officers?" And of all his remarks there is none made so telling of truth by an exaggerating touch, as the saying that we have no middle class, "for though we are perpetually bragging of it as our safety, it is nothing but a poor fringe on the mantle of the upper." We have said that there is little to illustrate the popular feeling while the events of his time were passing; but there is one faithful picture of the state of mind to which the ordinary citizen in nine cases out of ten is reduced by war news; and as he describes it in his best style, and is himself the citizen in question in his villa outside Boulogne, we may close with it our glance at matters political—only remarking that his good humour is more flattered by it than his intelligence in watching foreign affairs. He wrote across the Channel:—

Everything that happens here we suppose to be an announcement of the taking of Sebastopol. When a church-clock strikes, we think it is the joy-bell, and fly out of the house in a burst of nationality—to sneak in again. If they practise firing at the camp, we are sure it is the artillery celebrating the fall of the Russian, and we become enthusiastic in a moment. I live in constant readiness to illuminate the whole house. Whatever anybody says, I believe; everybody says every day that Sebastopol is in flames. Sometimes the Commander-in-Chief has blown himself up with seventy-five thousand men. Sometimes he has "cut" his way through Lord Raglan, and has fallen back on the advancing body of the Russians, one hundred and forty-two thousand strong, whom he is going to "bring up" (I don't know where from, or how, or when, or why) for the destruction of the Allies. All these things, in the words of the Catechism, "I steadfastly believe," until I become a mere driveller, a moonstruck, babbling, staring, credulous, imbecile, greedy, gaping, wooden-headed, addle-brained, wool-gathering, dreary, vacant, obstinate civilian.

Of public political life he knew nothing, having no nearer practical acquaintance with it than the part he took once in an Administrative Reform meeting. One of his most fixed habits of mind was to have a supreme self-opinionated contempt for the House of Commons. But had he accepted any one of the chances of public life that he was offered, he would have learned there, in seeing every possible side of any one measure, that every reform must needs be a far slower and more patient business than the preaching of its theories. He was all energy and impetuosity; he was as sanguine as no one could be who had not judged all things by the experience of such a triumph as his. He took no meaning from the fact that it has been the toil of lives, and it has taken the judgment of years of trial, for men to make for the multitude one law that can lift them up without causing worse confusion, one system of lightening their burdens without disturbing the balance of a whole community. Again, in his novels the same too-sanguine spirit shows itself in many merely domestic characters; though, in truth, we own to a weakness for preferring to be deluded with the brighter view of mankind rather than deceived in the other direction by sweeping satires upon all the world's hollowness. Whatever was bright and hopeful had a special attraction for Dickens. In the short narrative that finishes the Letters with a sketch of his life's close, we are told that his love of fresh air, light, and flowers amounted almost to a passion. It is a counterpart of his being drawn to dwell upon the pleasant and sunny side of life. "The comfort is," he wrote once, on hearing painful news, "that all the strange and terrible things come uppermost, and that the good and pleasant things are mixed up with every moment of our existence so plentifully that we scarcely heed them." The chance expression covers much of his philosophy of the world, and it holds a great deal of comforting truth. But when he went so far as to work with hot impulse in the confidence that human things were righting themselves easily, swiftly, through mere human wisdom and cheery good-nature, then it was that his philosophy failed him. Witness the sanguine view he took of the work that was to be done by his weekly magazine, with its gospel of good-fellowship and its campaign of reforms, to be worked by means of unearthing and denouncing all abuses, and recommending a cheerful hand-in-hand system of providing for the people. His object, he wrote, was "the raising up of those that are down, and the general improvement of our social condition." This sounds very well, if there had not been added in another letter the avowal of the self-reliant system:—"We hope to do some solid good, and we mean to be as cheery and pleasant as we can." The magazine

was a pecuniary success and nothing else, and the proposed motive has sunk out of sight years ago. The first hopefulness was much the same as that which prompted him to say to Lord Lytton, regarding the Guild of Literature and Art, that they held in hand "the peace and honour of men of letters for centuries to come;" and yet it ended only in a bitter disappointment. He carried the same too-rash confidence into the philosophy advocated by his novels. It is far too often of the earth, earthy; of endowing attractive characters with a liking for showing generosity in convivial pleasures, or making them work out noble ends by means and from motives utterly human. We have before now dwelt on the almost total want of any recognition there of the doctrine of grace. It is the great mistake of the novels, that the shrinking of their author from any public religious avowal caused him to draw bright pictures of purely natural goodness, teaching thereby that most mischievous fallacy, that earthly duty-doing may become a substitute for religion, and God and His grace need not be borne in mind. It is an impossible theory, on which the world is always making one long experiment, like a gambler's desperate game, with effort prolonged, and ruin at the end of it. There can no more be human goodness without grace, than there can be colour without light. Those who know nothing of physical science will maintain that they themselves and the objects round them preserve their natural colours in darkness. The belief in natural goodness without the presence of grace shows an equal confusion and ignorance with regard to the queen of sciences. And the more we feel from the perusal of his letters how deep his religious instinct was, the more we regret the erroneous form it took, and the false notion that such questions should be kept in the background, to be disposed of as secretly and conveniently as possible; as if, forsooth, religion was to be treated as a confused shadow, that would interfere with the cheery brightness that forms for mankind so poor a substitute for it. Seen in its true light, the greatest elevating power for the poor whom he loved, their strongest social bond with all higher ranks, the very poetry of their prosaic lives, is this religion that was the one thing he jealously hid from them. Without its full splendour falling on his life, or showing him theirs, well might he write to a friend the few bitter words that he penned in a moment of weariness, even in his triumph:—"What a dream it is, this work and strife, and how little we do in the dream after all."

Those amongst us who feel an interest in the letters of the novelist, will not fail to seek in them something deeper than glimpses of Charles Dickens among his friends, or as an author,

or as a reader, or before the world as a Radical reformer or a politician of shallow views and ultra-Liberal prejudice. They will be eager to find traces of his inner life, to supplement the little already known of his views on the one supreme subject. But there is in these letters little to add to what his biography made known, and the letter to his youngest son (published there first and reproduced here) contains still the clearest expression of his own belief. A letter to another son at parting repeats the same thing in other words:—"You know that you have never been hampered with religious forms of restraint, and that with mere unmeaning forms I have no sympathy. But I most strongly and affectionately impress upon you the priceless value of the New Testament, and the study of that book as the one unfailing guide in life. Deeply respecting it, and bowing down before the character of our Saviour, as separated from the vain constructions and inventions of men, you cannot go very wrong, and will always preserve at heart a true spirit of veneration and humility." The first article of his creed, then, was free interpretation, a belief bred in him, no doubt, by family tradition, and fostered by his habit of self-confidence; but the result predicted of such self-teaching, the safeguard it is infallibly to be, is as rash a conclusion as he ever sprang to. The world's chaos shows the real result of the experiment; yet there are thousands who stand always in this frame of mind, and we might call it less unreasonable than many a sect, if it were not folly to count any degree of near or far, when truth is missed even by the infinite difference that men call a hair's breadth. Another word of advice to his sons, regarded daily prayer night and morning, from which he himself had found assistance all his life. And he reminds them, too, how he had written the New Testament history in simple words for them, that they might learn it in earliest childhood.\* Nothing could better explain his feeling towards High Church principles, than his saying to a friend that he did not know what he should do if his son were "to get hold of any Conservative or High Church notions;" but for the deepest depth at the opposite extreme of the scale he had, not dislike, but disgust, and he showed it freely by making Stiggins and Chadband walk out of his novels bodily into the world to be typical for evermore. Offence was taken and explanation rendered necessary when he was writing of "the Shepherd," who took refreshment only after condemning all taps as "wanities," and in whose defeat the author revelled as much as Sam Weller

\* This narrative, written expressly for his own children only, is never to be published; therefore the "Letters" are the last possible book from his hand.

himself. The explanation given by Dickens is a sound truth tersely told :—

Permit me to say, in reply to your letter, that you do not understand the intention (I daresay the fault is mine) of that passage in the *Pickwick Papers* which has given you offence. The design of "the Shepherd," and of this and every other allusion to him, is to show how sacred things are degraded, vulgarised, and rendered absurd, when persons who are utterly incompetent to teach the commonest things take upon themselves to expound such mysteries, and how in making mere cant phrases of divine words, these persons miss the spirit in which they had their origin.

Similar umbrage was often taken to other things; and courteous explanations abound. The distinction of Fagin as "the Jew," was accounted for to an indignant Jewish lady; the novelist declaring that it referred to nationality and not religion, just as it would be unpardonable to call a Spanish Fagin-like character the Roman Catholic, but permissible to distinguish him as "the Spaniard." It may be of interest to add that the lady was not satisfied. A third explanation had to be given to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, that body being irritated at the ignorant ragged "Jo" having sat upon their step and afterwards swept it for thanks. Dickens did not give in an inch in his answer. His outcry was always for the education and comfort of the poor at home, in place of the sending of religious enlightenment (or rather of English money and bibles) abroad. He had faith in compulsory education, but its ten first years leave still many a Jo gaping at the hieroglyphs over the shops, a mere homeless animal but for the gift of speech, and as ignorant of soul, virtue, God—as of Sanscrit.\* There is a power, of which he knew nothing, but which has done more for the poor of the great cities than all the ragged schools, philanthropical societies, and Government Bills put together. Only the Church can effectually reach, soothe and save those pariahs of our rich civilisation; but the work of the Church is silent in the intricate byways or in the crowded orphanages; it is labour unobserved, because continual and not new; and its statistics are left to another world, rather than vaunted in this.

We have digressed, but it is never a long journey back from the subject of the poor to Charles Dickens himself. The traces of his own habitual feeling in religion are found in his many letters of sympathy or condolence. Trust in God and the

---

\* Not two months ago, in the year of grace 1880, two vagrant boys, found sleeping under the Covent Garden portico, were questioned at Bow Street; and to enquiries about religion they knew no answer, till one of them stammered out, "The Strand, sir."

thought of immortality he aptly names the "the two harbours of a shipwrecked heart." A beautiful expression occurs too in a letter to his sister, when he is "heartily glad" that even in her sorrow she has gone out in the open air—"There is a soothing influence in the sight of the earth and sky, which God put into them for our relief, when He made the world in which we are all to suffer, and strive, and die." Again, he writes to console his old friend Macready for domestic loss, dwelling on the comfort of a steady trust in God, and hoping that the spirits that have gone before may, "from the regions of mercy to which they have been called, smooth the path you have to tread alone." If the words were not words only, he must have been influenced by that instinct of our nature which in many cases is like the reflection of existing truths. There was the doctrine of prayer and intercession glimmering in the mind of the writer; unless, indeed, he would do what an Oxford dignitary denounces in a certain fiction—shelter himself behind that subtle distinction between invocation and intercession. His ideas were always vague regarding departed souls; he doubts whether the grief of the living may trouble them in their unknown abiding place; or, when he is aglow with joy at the grandeur of American scenery, he thinks of his youngest sister-in-law, Mary, whose memory was always dear to him, and first wishes that she could share his enjoyment, and then recollects that doubtless she has visited that scene many times already. These make up his ideas of spirit life, if we add to them a few more ordinarily found outside the Church, such as the transformation of beatified souls into angels.

A suggestive touch of sadness comes into one letter, that is otherwise blithe enough. It reveals a thirst for something, without which the vexed course of his life was hopelessly unsatisfying,—an undefinable longing under which, in his religion of the blue sky and jovial humanity, he gave himself a stone for bread. "This," he wrote, "is one of what I call my wandering days before I fall to work. I seem to be always looking at such times for something I have not found in life, but possibly may come to, a few thousands of years hence, in some other part of some other system. God knows. At all events, I won't put your pastoral pipe out of tune by talking about it. I'll go and look for it on the Canterbury road, among the hop-gardens and orchards." However much of worldly disappointment and its restlessness is written here, there is a sense, too, of a void needing something more than this world's repose to fill it.

If we turn back to the Italian letters, in quest of more of those half-defined spirit-footprints, we shall see less than in the letters already published by Mr. Forster. In fact, in many ways,



the present letters from the Continent are not so interesting as those printed in his *Life*; and the most brilliant description here, addressed to Maclise, and bright with colour even through pen and ink, is one of the letters that everyone has before now read in full elsewhere. We have already touched upon his sentiments regarding Italy, and we do not wish to dwell again upon the great blemish that spoiled his "Pictures," the one harsh prejudice that lowers their whole tone. We shall pass it over where it occurs, and that is but seldom, in the letters. In these he never lets drop any happy remark that lives in recollection, like that wonderful saying of Rogers, said in a letter, too, that at Naples we see most with the eye, at Rome with the memory, at Venice with the imagination; nor with all his fantastic touches of description does he ever with any word give anything better than a London sight-seer's impression of Italy; the poet, already referred to, gave a nobler glimpse of our Lake District than he of Italy, when he wrote that he had rambled with Wordsworth, "and the mists and sunbeams gave revelations of Heaven." Now, Charles Dickens in the Italian churches, was exactly the same as he was in the open air of Italy; his letters home gave no evidence that he saw anything with a spiritual appreciation, that he looked backward to history, or beyond externals to a hidden meaning. Catholic ritual was a mere senseless pageant to him, nor did he even discover its beauty through an æsthetic sense. He noted the ornamentation of the walls, the draught-swept curtains by the door, the women's fans and veils; but how those walls had risen, and why pomp and splendour were sought, were subjects as indifferent to him as the trivial custom of carrying veil or fan. He watched "the queerest figures kneeling against pillars, and the strangest people passing in and out;" but in what worship they knelt, and why they passed in and out, and for how many centuries their forefathers had done the same—all these vital questions do not seem to have got uppermost in his mind. It is all shown in one chance sentence, where he wrote that the day after he reached Rome they were "making a saint," and it is quite clear that the saint and the doctrine were forgotten in hitting off a facetious remark about the wax candles. In fact, in the churches he saw only with his eyes, and etherealised no earthly thought. This, coupled with the national prejudices he brought with him, forms the most probable reason why what he saw in Italy did not produce any deep effect, in any direction, upon his mind. Yet that some effect was produced, at least at one time when he was in Genoa, is certain from the fact that in his dreams his thoughts turned anxiously to the question of religion. Otherwise there is no accounting for one

of the most remarkable pages in Mr. Forster's book, the description of the dream in the Peschiere. It is not reproduced in the present volumes, but every reader of the "Life of Dickens" will be able to call the passage to mind;\* and, however lightly we may look upon dreams, this one is acknowledged at least to have the same value as a straw in the wind. Mr. Forster says, "it strengthens other evidences—of which there are many in his life—of his not having escaped those trying regions of reflection which most men of thought and all men of genius have at some time to pass through," and he adds that in the two subsequent years Dickens turned to studying the "Life of Arnold" with the greatest admiration. The nature of the dream may be briefly called to mind here, merely as a witness to the strong effect that waking thoughts and realities had clearly taken beforehand upon the dreamer's mind. He slept in the Palazzo Peschiere, in a room which had been once a chapel, and where still the old altar stood, with above it a mark where a picture had once hung; and he had wondered what the picture might have been, and what was the face. Nearly all night he had lain awake, hearing at intervals the ringing of convent bells. And these were the sources from which the dream may have been evolved: but it had no confusion or hurry, his feelings during it were most ardent and animated, and on awaking he repeated it over and over that afterwards nothing might be added or changed unconsciously. "In an indistinct place," he wrote to his friend, "which was quite sublime in its indistinctness, I was visited by a Spirit. I could not make out the face, nor do I recollect that I desired to do so. It wore a blue drapery, as the Madonna might in a picture by Raphael; and bore no resemblance to any one I have known except in stature." He felt that it was his young sister Mary; and knowing in some indefinable way her compassion for him, he was "cut to the heart" by its intensity, and, sobbing, asked a sign that she had really come. A wish was then named and agreed upon.

"But answer me one other question," I said, in an agony of entreaty lest it should leave me. "What is the True religion?" As it paused a moment without replying, I said—good God, in such an agony of haste lest it should go away!—"You think, as I do, that the form of religion does not so greatly matter, if we try to do good? or," I said, observing that it still hesitated and was moved with the greatest compassion for me, "perhaps the Roman Catholic is the best? perhaps it makes one think of God oftener and believe in Him more steadily?" "For *you*," said the Spirit, full of such heavenly tenderness for me that I felt as if my heart would break "for *you* it is the best!" Then I

---

\* See "Life of Charles Dickens," vol. i. p. 387.

awoke, with the tears running down my face, and myself in exactly the condition of the dream. It was just dawn.

It is only sufficient to add that the young girl whom he questioned in the dream had, during her life, been of his own belief; and it will be clear that the origin of his entreaties lay in some previous conflict within his mind; and this gives a mysterious weight to his words—"perhaps it makes one think of God oftener, and believe in Him more steadily." The whole true story of his experience is as beautiful a tale as he ever told; but, like many a touching tale, it bears a meaning sadder than itself.

With such constant activity of mind, it is not wonderful to discover that Charles Dickens might have been credited with being a seer of strange sights. Taking into account the power of his nervous and mental energy, some inexplicable experiences of his, and above all his attraction to all weird tales and fancies, it is surprising that he was never allured towards the snare of spiritualism. Mr. Forster credits him with a religious belief founded on depth of sentiment rather than clearness of faith. If his anchor was so frail a thing as even the deepest sentiment, it is a still greater wonder that he did not drag it towards that mirage of a false spiritual world. He was steadied, possibly, by the great and varied amount of serious enterprise in which he was always engaged: possibly by his innate hatred of "hum-bugs," and the transparent phenomena that must have been brought out more plentifully during the early days of the movement in its modern form. Without any doubt, he was of the mental constitution to do wonders in the sect, if he chose; but there is as little doubt that, through his distaste for it, he was saved from the untimely shattering of the nervous energy that carried him through life. His attraction towards the marvellous is well known; there is proof of it in his Christmas stories with their goblin element, and in the character of many of his own shorter tales, and of his readiness to accept ghostly experiences for his Magazine, or to make up its Christmas Number with a name suggestive of unearthly tales told in the winter firelight. Of his own experiences the strangest mentioned is that of his dreaming beforehand of the name of an unknown lady and the most notable colour worn by her, and his recognition of her the next night, when he was introduced to the very same individual after one of his readings. There is another instance almost equally striking, where, in one of these letters from Folkestone, he relates how he walked out on a rainy day, observing the dulness of the streets; and the very instant after he had wondered what could possibly assemble fifty people, a pair of runaway horses dashed into sight, and in

a moment the place was full of the uproar of a crowd. Add to such instances of presentiment, and such a leaning towards all mysteries, the fact that he possessed, but rarely exercised, strong mesmeric powers, and then will be readily seen the possibility of his having let slip his simple Broad Church views, if once that shadowy creed of shadows had won him as an experimentalist. Our speculations on this point may close with a most excellent note of his written to Mrs. Trollope, and embodying his very sensible notions of entertainment by spiritualism :

I was out of town on Sunday, or I should have answered your note immediately on its arrival. I cannot have the pleasure of seeing the famous "medium" to-night, for I have some theatricals at home. But I fear I shall not in any case be a good subject for the purpose, as I altogether want faith in the thing. I have not the least belief in the awful unseen world being available for evening parties at so much per night; and although I should be ready to receive enlightenment from any source, I must say I have very little hope of it from the spirits who express themselves through mediums, as I have never yet observed them to talk anything but nonsense, of which (as Carlyle would say) there is probably enough in these days of ours and in all days among mere mortality.

Another, but an incomparably greater and wider peril, was as completely escaped; and with results that were not only happy for himself but for his unnumbered readers. Towards free-thinking on the fundamental doctrine of faith, towards the ripe atheism of our days, he never wavered. In his letters the expressed dependence on God's permission for his work or movements, the word of gratitude for health, or for the success of his books, or for the fruitfulness of his fancy, come with such ease of habit as to pass for mere chance phrases; and yet we believe they had for him some weight. However much the supernatural order is ignored in his books, it is by no means out of sight in his letters. And the words that tell his belief in it throw a touching light upon his wonderful life-history. "I know I do not exaggerate," he had once written of that period of his own boyhood which he afterwards, not without shrinking pain, gave to a fictitious hero; "I know that, but for the mercy of God, I might easily have been for any care that was taken of me, a little robber or a little vagabond." And just as that sad but grateful avowal would not strike home to the heart but for its thought of Divine mercy; so in the letters of this man of genial humour, and brilliant prosperity, and high fame, there is no touch like the touch upon eternal things to realise for us the true, human, sympathy-craving personality of him who lived in such a world of fancies.

"Think of me at my best!" are the parting words he places

upon the lips of a character in his favourite story—a character unutterably below and directly opposite to his own in every way, unless, indeed, in that personal influence which is the undefined possession of a gifted few, and which, like every other gift of Heaven, is basely misused by some, and most nobly used by others. If ever there was a man who with good reason could plead to be thought of at his best, it is Charles Dickens himself; and thinking of him at his best alone, we shall close the volume of his letters. At such a moment many thoughts crowd upon us, and foremost is the sense of thankfulness that such great power as his was used in sending forth for the world's eager enjoyment so very much that was bright, refreshing, and worthy—so very little that we would wish retracted. And to realise what kindly feeling we owe to such a memory, and what gratitude to the Giver of all good thought and noble purpose, we may glance at what might have happened had another risen in his place, or had such unprecedented power been carelessly or badly used. Three thoughts will suggest the awful possibilities of what could have been; but since it was not, we refrain from looking upon so dark a picture otherwise than by briefest suggestion. What if such a man, persuading so vast an audience, had been not only ultra-Liberal, but dyed with Radicalism of another hue? What if this fiction, that through forty years has overflowed the home countries and the New World, had been a gradual descent to such literature as vitiates the taste of France; such romance as pretends to attack the follies of each era, and only aggravates the evils it professes to cry down? The effect would not have ended with his works; imitators would have perpetuated it, as they try to perpetuate his style; and the whole literature of fiction might have been degraded. Lastly, what if those novels had carried with them the spirit of scepticism, made as insidious as only works of imagination can make it? In one case we should have had to call their tone Socialism; in the second, immorality; in the third, atheism for the people. Of course, in all three cases they would not have enjoyed so hearty a welcome, not even with the attractive element of twice as much humour. But a certain amount of popularity they would have attained. The evil would have been not only secretly incalculable, but appreciable outwardly. For in so brief a time no other books ever commended themselves so widely, to high and low, to the upper classes as well as to those who, barely able to read them, can understand every word, and can see the sympathy with such lives as theirs. But the great evil has been averted. Providence ruled it so, and it was a willing hand that was guided.

And, putting aside those more terrible possibilities, we may ponder how sad a loss there would have been had not this active mind been characterised by that care for the poor—a tenderness for all human obscurity and lowliness. One of the poets has versified an Arab story, wherein is told how an angel wrote in a resplendent book the names of those that loved his Master; but the chief to whom he came in vision did not know the Lord of the angel, and he begged to have his name written as one who loved his fellow-men; and lo! when the angel brightened the tent again and showed the golden book, his name stood first. Perhaps the legend finds a secret interpretation before the last slow parting between these shadows and the great reality beyond. Well do we know there can neither be safe rest, nor acceptable worship, nor perfect duty, without truth; but there can be nothing whatever without charity.

---



## ART. VII.—TEXT-BOOKS OF PHILOSOPHY.

1. *Summa Philosophica, in usum scholarum.* Auctore P. F. THOMA MARIA ZIGLIARA. Tom. tres. Lugduni, Briday. 1878.
2. *Elementa Philosophiæ Christianæ.* Auctore P. F. ALBERTO LEPIDI. Tom. tres. Parisiis, Lethielleux. 1875-80.
3. *Philosophia Elementaria ad usum Academicæ ac præsertim Ecclesiasticæ Juventutis.* Opera et studio R. P. FR. ZEPHYRINI GONZALES, O.P. Tom. tres. Malriti, Lopez. 1868.
4. *De Intellectualismo, juxta mentem Syllabi Vaticanique Concilii adversus errores philosophicos præcipue Rationalismum, Positivismum et Novam Criticem.* Auctore P. M. BRIN, Presbytero, Philosophiæ in Majori Seminario Constantiensi Professore. Tom. tres. Parisiis, Bray et Retaux. 1874.
5. *Institutiones Philosophicæ quas tradebat in Collegio Romano.* DOMINICUS PALMIERI, S.J. Tom. tres. Romæ, Cuggiani Santini. 1874.
6. *Quæstiones Philosophicæ,* auctore Sylvestro Mauro. Editio novissima. Tom. tres. Cenomani, Leguicheux-Gallienne. 1875.
7. *Lezioni di Filosofia Scolastica.* Di G. M. CORNOLDI, D.C.D.G. Secunda ed. Ferrata, Tipografia Sociale. 1875.
8. *Institutiones Philosophiæ Speculativæ ad mentem S. Thomæ Aquinatis.* Auctore J. M. CORNOLDI, S.J. In Latinum versæ a Dominico Agostini, Venetiarum patriarchâ. Bononiæ, ex officinâ Pontificiâ Mareggianâ. 1878.
9. *The Metaphysics of the School.* By THOMAS HARPER, S.J. Vol. I. London, Macmillan. 1879.
10. *Métaphysique d'Aristote.* Traduite en Français, avec des notes perpétuelles. Par J. BARTHELEMY-SAINT-HILAIRE. Tomes 3. Paris. 1879.

IT is to be expected that the very decisive pronouncement of Pope Leo XIII. in favour of the Philosophy and Theology of St. Thomas of Aquin will give a considerable impulse to the production of Text-books of Scholastic Philosophy. Perhaps it is hardly correct to say that any new elementary texts have actually been produced since the appearance of the Encyclical *Æterni Patris*, on St. Dominic's day of last year. Father Harper has published his elaborate and remarkable book since

that date ; Father Albert Lepidi, the distinguished Dominican professor of Louvain, has sent out the third volume of his "Elements." These are, perhaps, the only publications which are actually new, or which can in any sense be said to owe their origin to the late Encyclical. But it is now perceived by those who deal in abstract philosophy—by the world of professors and the world of students—that more than one Text-book which came out on the eve of the appearance of the Encyclical itself, must have been prompted and inspired by the same spirit which has urged both Pius IX. and the present Sovereign Pontiff to make the series of pronouncements which have culminated in the recent solemn Pontifical Act. It used to be difficult to find a Text-book of any kind. Students of only five-and-twenty years ago will recollect how the choice lay between such writers (excellent in many points) as Goudin and Roselli, and manuscript notes of various degrees of authenticity, authority, and legibility. Now, it would almost appear that we are threatened with too many. Not only have we Jesuit authors of various shades—Liberatore, Palmieri, Tongiorgi, Cornoldi—but no less than three admirable manuals by the greatest lights of the Order which possesses the truest Thomistic tradition, the "Elementa" of Father Lepidi, the "Philosophia Elementaria" of Father Gonzales, and the "Summa Philosophica" of Cardinal Zigliara. If the Scholastic Philosophy is to flourish again, and to influence the thought of the world at large, it is of the last importance to have good Text-books. Few seminaries or schools, and not very many universities, can hope to possess in every generation a teacher whose native force and genius are such as to enable his hearers to learn, and learn thoroughly, from himself alone. The Text-book is, no doubt, a modern invention. A very respectable and obstinate tradition has opposed Text-books down to our own times. It is by no means certain that there are not, at this hour, seminaries and colleges where the students are still painfully writing out the "dictates" of a professor who has spent, on his own part, much needless labour in elaborating, as if they were original, matters which have been done to his hand, and infinitely better done, for many a year. There is room for originality in a professor, no matter how eminent have been the writers who have been beforehand with him. And there is also a place for the dictation of notes. All this is so true, that a teacher of philosophy who merely construed a Text-book would not be worth his salt. But Text-books are modern conveniences, and, rightly used, are of the greatest assistance. It is worth while, therefore, to inquire a little, at the present moment, into the qualities and characteristics which ought to distinguish a good Text-book.

Abbé Brin, in an introduction to the philosophical hand-book to which he has given the unhappy name of "De Intellectualismo," expresses his opinion that, considering what Text-books were (in 1874), it was no wonder that the young student of philosophy began his studies with distaste and prosecuted them without interest. The writers of Courses, he declares—excepting, however, from his sweeping denunciation Liberatore and Sanseverino, and, by an afterthought in a note, "many others"—waste their space in the exposition of their various systems, pick out controversies, difficulties, and idle questions, and treat them at length, whilst the true principles are touched on very lightly indeed. Philosophic introductions "accommodated" to the use of beginners are deficient in order, in method, and in clearness; they "indulge" too much in false systems of antiquity or pernicious errors of the moderns; and they are every one sadly deficient in the exposition and confutation of the errors of the present day. Abbé Brin adds, in another note, that this description applies to the Text-books in use in most colleges. And if his words are applicable to France, we have, in the words of Padre Cornoldi, S.J., an equally lamentable picture of what is true of Italy. Writing in 1872, that is eight years ago, P. Cornoldi declares, in the introduction to his "*Filosofia Scolastica*," that he was led to write his short hand-book simply because he could find none already existing, worthy of the name, which could be put into the hands of youths studying at the universities, and at once prepare their minds for deeper studies, and protect them intellectually against the errors of the times.

From every European University (he says) Philosophy is either banished altogether, or else it is given in so meagre and incoherent a way that it cannot be called Philosophy. And if, as rarely happens, there is some show made of studying it seriously, there is such *variety and diversity* among the views put forth, that you cannot take up one without flatly contradicting another. The divergence which exists in the schools of the present day is so general, that I should hardly be able to find two professors of the same branch, in the same institution, who agreed, I will not say completely, but on first principles. And as a natural consequence no one teaches the same doctrine for ten years consecutively, but there is perpetual contradiction and change. . . . What was I to do? Not being able to embrace any Philosophy current in our times, and being most unwilling to abandon my purpose and so to play into the hands of those who desire to see Philosophy driven from human society, I could only do one of two things; I must either follow some great light of the present day and make a Philosophy out of other men's labours, or make up my mind at once to follow that which was venerated of old, and which for twenty centuries had prevailed in the schools, whose adherents and upholders have been some

of the greatest geniuses of whom our race can boast, and which, even in our own days, the humble and strenuous lovers of truth have jealously preserved, like sacred fire, from profane eyes and carefully defended and propagated (p. xiii.).

If only one half of this was true six or eight years ago, there was certainly plenty of room for Text-books. Yet Text-books, and fairly good ones, there undoubtedly were, at the time those words were written. Not to mention older names, there were at least Liberatore and Prisco. One cannot doubt, from the testimony of such men as Brin and Cornoldi, that in spite of what had gone on for thirty or forty years, the scholastic philosophy was hardly known in the greater part of even the seminaries of France and Italy; that Text-books or dictates were used such as here described—poor, contradictory, and dull; and that, therefore, there was ample reason for the Encyclical of August 4th, 1879.

The more fortunate generation which is now in the schools, or about to enter them, is better supplied. They have only to choose. Yet the choice of a Text-book is not such an easy matter. We may begin by saying, as every one will say, that there is no such thing as an absolute Text-book. Introductions to Philosophy, like other aids and instruments, must be judged by their fitness for those who have to use them. In judging, therefore, of a Text-book, we have to take into consideration the age and the previous preparation of the youths who are to profit by them, the time at the disposal of the class, and also the *milieu* in which the student is to live and use his Philosophy. Then would come the question of what Philosophy to choose, if that question were not now practically decided for us; and in any case there is the consideration of the division, arrangement, and method of the Text-book.

There can be little hesitation in admitting that the generality of our students of Philosophy begin to study it too soon.\* There may be a hundred reasons for this, with which we have nothing to do at present; but it is quite certain that a certain maturity of mind and fulness of acquirement is necessary in order to engage with profit in studies so abstract as logic and metaphysics. Mere grammatical work, and the short literary flights which unfledged minds make in their course of "humanities" are a poor preparation for dealing with the deepest questions of life and being. A strong and extended course of mathematics, a well-grounded facility in every sort of analysis, and a familiarity with the abstract principles of poesy and rhetorical effect

---

\* It is not pleasant to have to admit that, practically, none but students destined for the ecclesiastical state do study "Philosophy" in England and Ireland.

—these are absolutely essential as a training for metaphysics proper. And such preparation cannot be made in a year or two, and cannot be attained at all unless the mind is suffered to assimilate slowly and gradually its training and its experiences, as the body grows with the nourishment which is given to it. Then, success in the acquisition of abstract Philosophy depends essentially on the intelligent interest with which the student takes it up. Grammar, history, literature, even mathematics, may be portioned out, set as tasks, tested by results, and the results, when unsatisfactory, improved by energetic measures on the part of teachers. But Philosophy must be learnt with the will, or it is not learnt at all. There is, no doubt, a certain amount of the terminology and of the mechanical apparatus which can be impressed on the unwilling or the sluggish mind. But metaphysical problems must be read from the inner side of consciousness, or they are never deciphered at all. A day soon comes to the learner when the words of his author or his teacher seem to labour, to stammer, and to fail. Hitherto, words have fairly conveyed a sense of reality; now, there is either a strange, undreamt of reality looming through the haze of explanation, or else there is fog and nothing else. It is at this moment that the metal of a student shows itself. If he is one who is not destined to succeed, he no sooner feels the unaccustomed darkness than he gives in: he looks again, perhaps, fails to see any the more clearly, and becomes passive, disheartened, acquiescent in failure. A few more such experiences, as world after world of the great ideal universe rolls past within reach of his intelligence, and he settles down to the conviction that Philosophy is obscure, unreal, and impalpable; and he looks forward to the day of his release. But the other sort of learner, when he feels for the first time the presence of some mighty idea, then first begins to feel his courage called upon and his temper challenged. The feeble parts of speech are there before his eyes, and the spoken words come and go; all his efforts only serve, at first, to bring him face to face with incoherence or blank nothing—as when some anxious searcher, watching for portents in the sky, fails to make his mechanism find the focus. But as he settles into silence, and memory fixes certain outlines, and imagination, quickened with effort, succeeds in blocking out the mysterious presence in something like its real shape, then by degrees that native and perennial light within him, by which we are in God's image, illuminates that shadowy thing, and it is bright as the day. The effort may be long and even painful; the obtrusive associations of distracting thought, the want of custom in knowing where to look, the physical difficulty of rousing the brain to the full exercise of its preliminary work,

all this is hard upon the beginner. But it is worth the labour, for he has taken his first step in the realms of abstract thought; he has "realized" one of those mighty foundations of the mental universe which are more firm and everlasting than any Alps or Andes. It was such apparitions from a spiritual world which came to Plato as he lay with dreamy eyes upon the banks of the Ilissus, which thrilled the heart and sense of Augustine when the pen of his "Confessions" stood still in midnights in Africa, which came and went in tranquil splendour in the cell of Thomas of Aquin. To have seen one of them once is to have it for ever. No want of use, no heaviness of sense will ever altogether banish it again. And as other views open themselves and deeper truths are subdued and conquered, Philosophy begins to be a light, a climate, and an atmosphere in the mind of the learner. So some men learn Philosophy, whilst others learn it not. But until the intelligence has found the secret and the joy of unveiling principles for itself and by its interior effort, the student only sits at the portals of the temple. He has not entered in.

It is for reasons like this that the best instructors so strongly advise that the study of abstract science be reserved for years when the mind is as mature as may be. It is very difficult to state, even approximately, the age when it would benefit a youth to begin Philosophy. It is clear that the number of his years must count for little in comparison with the question of his real education. Then, as to maturity of education, temperament goes for much, and regular training from childhood goes for more. Some boys will delight in abstract thought from the first moment they look into Euclid, or face the deductions of comparative philology, or make acquaintance with the sonorous generalizations of Cicero. Again, a youth who begins study late in life will often bring to his work such intelligent energy of will, such a mature appreciation of problems to be solved and ends to be achieved, that he is very soon fit to grapple with a philosophic Text-book. On the other hand, there are nearly always practical reasons for not waiting too long. First of all there is the undoubted fact that, the moment a youthful mind begins to take to serious thought, it is time to provide that mind with the best material and the truest guidance. Young men are very impressionable and very receptive; modern thought, repeated in a thousand shapes, penetrates everywhere; and any derelict intelligence found floating on the ocean of intellectual life is quickly seized and refitted in some dockyard of the enemy. Then, with the vast majority of students, Philosophy is a means to an end; it is a preparation for Theology; and since the requirements of the missions hurry on the study of Theology, so the requirements of Theology hasten the years of



Philosophy. To speak, however, with as near an approximation as possible to what will generally hold true, it may be asserted that youths under sixteen lose their time in beginning Philosophy; and that even up to the age of seventeen or eighteen no one is fit to undertake that study who has not gone through a steady course equivalent to the six or seven years of the curriculum of a well-conducted college. The late Bishop Dupanloup, who had such a wide experience as an educator, thus speaks of the folly of what he calls "precipitating" boys into Philosophy before their time:

Nothing can be more fatal. It is to disgust them with Philosophy for life, and to condemn them to a course of simple torture. From an educational point of view, I know nothing more cruelly absurd. It is to require from immature and feeble minds an effort of which they are incapable, and which crushes them. Besides, the general weakness of classical studies is such, that many of them have only half done their humanities and their rhetoric. These previous studies have neither developed nor strengthened, as they should have done, the faculties which should now grapple seriously and profitably with philosophic science. Philosophy completes, fortifies, and crowns literary study; but only on one condition—that literary studies have been really made, and well made. Philosophy is a preparation for scientific study; but, again, only on the condition that the intellect be sufficiently mature to undertake it. If I had the honour to be a Professor of Philosophy, I would never receive into my class a student who, on account of defective previous studies, was incapable of doing any good in it. And to those who pressed me not to reject a candidate, I would say with St. Augustine, "*Filius tuus cœpit jam philosophari; ego eum reprimo ut disciplinis necessariis prius excultus vigentior et firmior insurgat.*" ("*Contra Academic,*" ii. 8.)\*

When we consider, ever so superficially, the questions and problems of which abstract philosophy treats, these words will certainly appear none too strong. Indeed, the strange thing would seem to be, not that youths of sixteen or seventeen are often poorly prepared for philosophic study, but that the greater part of Philosophy can ever be seriously put before any students whatever who are not really matured and cultured to begin with. The student of Philosophy has not to learn a grammar or to master a new branch of mathematics. Grammar, however great a triumph for the genius who first draws up or completes its generalizations, is not difficult to take in and remember. Mathematics, even in its highest flights, preserves a family likeness in all its generations and families that powerfully assists the imagination which has once taken the mathematical impress, to seize the key of each mystery as it rises in

\* De la haute Education intellectuelle, T. ii. p. 211.

its turn. But Philosophy not only deals with the highest abstractions, but with abstract questions in which absolute demonstration is difficult to attain, and in regard of which the greatest minds of which the human race can boast have not only argued for years and centuries, but have marked every century, and almost every year, by profound and irreconcilable disagreements. It would take, not a clever schoolboy, but a thoughtful and deeply-read man, to appreciate at their proper value even the preliminary discussions in ideas, judgments, and reasoning, considered merely as mental instruments. Who but a trained thinker could hope to arrive, by true native process of thought, at any conclusion worth having on the immortality of the soul, on the manner in which mind understands matter, on the argument for and against Free Will? If Plato, and Anselm, and Thomas, and Cajetan, spent days and nights of ever-deepening thought on Being and its categories, on finite and infinite, on essence and existence, what mental product is to be expected from the conscientious but far from brilliant "philosopher" who takes these great questions in his morning's work, and gets them up in business form between his breakfast and the mid-day Angelus? If he knew what he was about he would almost, as it seems, shrink back in a fearful reverence from the great names which recur so often in the pages he gets so coolly by heart. If he did but know it, he is like a man standing on some plain of Babylon, where great cities lie buried, or like a climber of mountain ranges where seams and fissures are the marks of fires that once flowed, and where sometimes the marred outline of a towering hill reminds the gazer where a mighty landslip happened long ago. Plato and Porphyry are mentioned, blamed in a sentence, and applauded in half-a-dozen lines. Kant has two paragraphs, one to explain his "system" and the second to demolish it. Descartes, like an uneasy ghost, pervades the pages of psychology, ever coming back to be chidden for his rash and sinful formula. If these, and many another name, as great and as mistaken, are hastily summoned, and hastily dismissed, and made to appear at one time as mere headings for a string of unreasonable opinions, at another as singularly shallow and transparent tyros of a time gone by, this is, perhaps, neither the fault of the student nor of the compiler of his Text-book. Philosophy is too large and too wide for Text-books. Systems do not easily lend themselves to be boiled down into abstracts. The conclusions of a philosophic mind are not unfrequently the least valuable part of what he leaves behind him, and few geniuses come out well when a compiler, pressed for space, formulates great books in a sentence apiece, and spits the formulas together. Yet no one can blame

the compiler. And Text-books, with all their drawbacks, are a necessity; whilst the students who use them, poor as the result may be of the year's or the two-years' course, must make that course. He may console himself with the knowledge that, provided he comes decently prepared, he will learn a great deal, even if he cannot be said, in any proper sense of the word, to have learnt Philosophy.

One reason, though by no means the only one, why the study of Philosophy should be preceded by a full course of humanities is, that the Text-books are written in Latin, and those who use them should know how to use Latin almost as a living language. In these times of physical science and modern languages, it is not at all a matter of course that a boy comes to the end of his collegiate classes with a well-grounded facility in the use of Latin. A hundred years ago, and less, three times the number of hours were given to Latin which can be spared now. The result is that boys, even of the upper classes of schools, who may be exceedingly well prepared in Horace or in Cicero's Orations, are generally unable to read with comfort and ease, at first sight, even works which are much less difficult in their subject-matter than Text-books of Philosophy. Latin is taught and learnt in a very narrow groove. The route taken lies, no doubt, through the very best country. But when a man has to spend so much of his after-life in homelier regions, it would seem advisable that he should be made acquainted with the roads and the method of travel which will there be required. To read Latin fluently, boys should have both more words at command and more practice in idiomatic variety. The difficulty of Catholic Colleges in these countries in regard to this is, that the whole tendency of the best classical education of the country is to use to the utmost those diminished hours which modern requirements have left for classics for the purpose of attaining great excellence in minute scholarship rather than a real living command of Latin as a language. Abroad, in Germany for instance, it is not so. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in his interesting notes on classical studies in Berlin,\* thus speaks of a lesson which he heard Dr. Ranke, brother of the historian, give to the first class (the highest) in the *Friedrich-Wilhelms Gymnasium*, on the "Philoctetes" of Sophocles:

He spoke Latin to his class and his class spoke Latin in answer; this is still a common practice in the German schools, though not so common as formerly. The German boys have certainly acquired through this practice a surprising command of Latin; Dr. Schopen's lesson at Bonn to his *prima* in extemporaneous translation into Latin

---

\* Higher Schools and Universities in Germany.

.... I heard with astonishment; a much wider command of the Latin vocabulary than our boys have, and a more ready management of the language, the Germans certainly succeed in acquiring (p. 115).

It is not probable, perhaps not advisable, that in England the classes of Philosophy, or even of Theology, should, at the present day, be held in Latin. On this point we shall have something to say presently. But it is to be hoped that the hour is far off when we shall have recourse to vernacular Text-books. There are many reasons why a Text-book should be in Latin. One most excellent reason is, that there are none in English that are worthy of the name. But the substantial and standing reason why we must have Latin texts is, that the use of Latin is an admirable and even an essential means of securing unity in philosophic teaching. There are, no doubt, many drawbacks in a Latin text. There is the want of familiarity with the language—and there is more in this than at first appears, for the mere power of construing a dead language is very far from enabling a reader to take in its force and its lights and shades. There is the danger of learning Philosophy by rote, and of repeating cabalistic formularies instead of assimilating intellectual life. There is the danger of what may be called a break of continuity between one's philosophy and the remainder of one's culture; of philosophy occupying a region apart, with terms and definitions of its own, and with few points of contact with the drift and speculations of current intellectual thought. The evil of this is easily understood when we remember that philosophy, to be true philosophy, must colour and dominate our whole mental constitution. If a man has one set of mental views for his study, and another for his conversation and his general reading, he is only a beast of burden and not a really cultured man. And the use of Latin words in the schools, whilst we use English everywhere else, certainly tends to encourage this defect. But, in spite of all this, we cannot do without Latin Text-books, not to say Latin philosophical treatises at large. Unity in philosophic teaching is of the first importance. The philosophy of Aristotle and of St. Thomas—which we here assume with the present Sovereign Pontiff to be synonymous with intellectual truth—is the precious inheritance of the Catholic clergy and laity, and that Philosophy they must have in its pure form and from its fountain head. It would be very different if, on the one hand, our principal philosophic task were to search for truth—to weigh the speculations of great teachers and the merits of hostile schools; or if, on the other, there were such a thing as "national" Philosophy, and each country had a right to enthrone its own eminent thinkers in the highest seats of abstract science. But it is not so, and

no one, it may be confidently affirmed, ever thinks of maintaining the claims of any of the great names who have immortalized their thoughts in English, French, German, or Italian, to be the Catholic Philosopher by excellence. The Catholic Philosophy has been written in Latin. It is true, as an objector might here remind us, that its source is the Greek of Aristotle, and that, therefore, it might be said that our books should be in Greek. But the answer to this is easy. Aristotle is the source of Catholic Philosophy only in the same way that Saxo Grammaticus was the author of *Hamlet*, or Holinshed of *Henry the Fifth*. Without making any comparison between transcendent geniuses—and it would be difficult to assert that the philosophic achievements of Aristotle have ever been surpassed—it is indisputably true that Scholastic Philosophy owes its form, its comparative completeness, its harmony with revelation, and the subtle illumination which it derives everywhere from revelation, to St. Thomas of Aquin. And what he, in Latin, began, his successors and disciples have, in Latin, continued. St. Thomas may almost be said to have invented a new dialect of Latin. Without denying the power and influence of those who preceded him, and especially of Blessed Albert the Great—who would have been a worthy leader and patron of the great Dominican school had there been no Thomas to succeed him—it may be said with perfect truth that he formed a language, somewhat in the sense in which the "*Divina Commedia*" formed a language. The Latin of the "*Summa Theologica*" is as remote from the Latin of Cicero, or even of Seneca, as is Italian or Spanish. But it is a true language, having a body of terms, a regular and unique construction, a perfect flexibility, and, above all—what may be considered the test of a cultured language—an altogether marvellous capacity for the deft expression of abstract thought and speculation. It is a language, moreover, which, by the very necessity of the case, is in great measure untranslatable. You can only render it into English by taking its own terms, and altering their terminations. *Forma* is "form," *materia* is "matter," *actus purus* is "pure act," *intellectivus passivus* is "the passive intellect," and so of a hundred other words and phrases. The things which these and other terms signify are at once the deepest and truest generalizations of the best science and the technical terms of Catholic Philosophy. Therefore they are at the same time untranslatable and indispensable. And since they must be explained, in whatever form they present themselves, it seems as easy to explain them in their Latin form as in their vernacular, and nearly as easy to make out a book which treats them in Latin as a book which offers a slight modification of them and

pretends that they are English. We do not, however, by any means intend to deny that great good may be done, and much light thrown on the Catholic Philosophy, by dissertations and formal treatises in the vernacular. A master of English can make the English language do almost anything; and as Father Harper so well points out, in a book which would go far to prove any one wrong who said that scholastic science could not be given in English, no one has a right to object to, or to reject as barbarous, those necessary and consecrated technical terms which are as much the property of the Scholastic Philosophy as those of any science are the property of that science. What is here insisted on is, that, for a beginner, an English version is not of very much advantage as far as regards easiness of comprehension. In most other respects it is a positive drawback. A Text-book in English must translate terms, forms, and phrases; but a translation always implies a gloss; no one can translate an obscure or abstruse treatise without giving to his work the colour of his own interpretation. It would be needful, therefore, in order to preserve unity, either to have an authoritative version, or else to print the Latin original, side by side with the translation. But either of these alternatives would be inconvenient. Then, how would a translator set about his work? A Text-book is not a large literary exercitation, like Father Harper's new work. It is by its nature brief, somewhat dry and very technical. Is the translator to preserve its technical form in a scrupulously literal version, and so produce a book which calls itself English, but is really no language at all—a monster among books, disagreeable to the English ear, and useless to every one but the untutored Englishman? Or is he to give us version for version, good and pure English for good Latin, a vernacular work of art for a work of art in a dead language, and to effect this by laying under contribution the best abstract writers of the day, and adapting their phraseology to the scholastic metaphysics? If he adopt the latter plan, no doubt he may produce a readable book; but it will have about as much relation to Scholastic Philosophy, as Mr. Ruskin's "Ethics of the Dust" has to the Nichomachæan Ethics of Aristotle. A learner would have no more chance of learning Philosophy from such a "good English" Text, than of learning geology from a popular article in a "Boy's Annual." For these reasons—now more than ever—it is necessary to adhere to our Latin Text-books. It is the only way to preserve from generation to generation the genuine expression of the Catholic Philosophy.

There are many kinds of Text-books, however, and many different ways of using them. In order to arrive at a just idea of what a Text-book should be, it will be useful, first of all, to



consider what is the end and purpose of the curriculum of mental Philosophy.

A man reasons long before he enters the school of philosophy, and he continues to reason, and probably advances in all his reasoning powers, after he has left that school far behind, up to the time when the day declines and the curtain is drawn over his intelligence, and he dies or becomes a child again. Philosophy is both a universal science and a special science. It is universal, because all men use its principles, and all but the rudest men have a smattering of its reflex operations. It is special, because it may be made the object of a special study and training, carried out with method, and resulting in the greater clearness, precision, and rapidity of all those mental processes which are its subject-matter. It is this special study of Philosophy which youths undertake who enter on what is called their "course of Philosophy." No doubt they often begin—and even finish, let it be whispered—without a very definite idea what it is meant to effect or produce in their mental life. Some have the idea that it is intended to prepare them to read with profit the scholastic theologians; others that it will help them to resist the infidel and materialistic science of the day; others, again, that there are matters in Philosophy which everybody should know something about; and others, finally, that it will perform the operation vaguely called "opening the mind." If the beginner turns to his manuals to find out what his new science will do for him, he is often met, it must be confessed, with the vaguest of declamation. Father Gonzales, for instance, for whose Text-book we have the highest admiration, has a paragraph on the "dignity and utility" of Philosophy, which reads more like a theme or exercise composed by one of his youngest and most unprecise beginners than the description of a tried professor. Cicero, Plato, Clement of Alexandria, Horace, are invoked to say that Philosophy is the mother of the arts, the guide of life, the foundress of cities, the inventress of laws, the prop of the Faith, the enemy of heresy, the constant ally of the Church, and innumerable other things. In some Text-books we are told that Philosophy cultivates the "nobler part of man;" that it enables us to understand better our "duties" to God, to our neighbour, and to ourself; that it helps us to defeat error and to understand truth. But it may be deliberately said that we find nowhere in the Text-books any such analysis of the benefits and advantages of abstract science as we find in Cardinal Newman's University Lectures. No one, certainly, would expect in a compendium one tithe of the elaborate exposition set down in those immortal essays; but what is meant is, that one scarcely meets, in the books in question, with

any well-argued statement of the immediate end of philosophic study—the training of the intellect as such, and the informing it with absolute truth. There is, doubtless, more than one good or plausible reason why the more remote purposes of Mental Philosophy are dwelt upon rather than the immediate object. From the beginning, since Clement of Alexandria advised the Christian student to make himself acquainted with all the learning of the Greeks, Christian writers have dwelt strongly on the ethical purposes of learning. With the ancient Fathers and scholastic founders, there was a great world beyond the world of Philosophy. It mattered little that you could reason, unless you reasoned for your soul's good and that of the Church. To be able to analyse the composition of man or the act of intelligence was of little value unless you ordered both body and soul, and all the acts of every power, to your last end. In these modern days it is difficult to say that one should not still insist on these views, as paramount and not to be passed over, and most of the Text-books have preserved the tradition, and give the student abundant moral reasons why he should make himself intellectually proficient. But we cannot help insisting that it is a drawback not to be told, at the outset, what intellectual proficiency really means.

The immediate aim, then, of a "course" of Philosophy is to accustom the mind to intellectual action, and to inform the mind with intellectual truth. The two members of this description do not mean quite the same thing, though they are very closely connected. Philosophy is, in fact, both a discipline and a growth in mental knowledge. It teaches us *how* to reason, but, also, *what* the truth is on the deepest of human questions. Other sciences are, in their measure, disciplines of the mind; such as, for instance, mathematics, philology, and the several branches of physics. But in no science, save Philosophy, are the subjects themselves of that deep, absolute, ultimate, and abstract character which causes them to be, not only most essential to be studied and learnt, but of all matters the best fitted for mental training and for the discipline of man's proper or peculiar powers. Setting on one side, for a moment, the question of the matter of Philosophy, let us observe that Philosophy, as a training, ought to aim at accustoming the mind to reasoning—that is, enabling it to travel quickly, accurately, and far, from idea to idea. There is no better or simpler description of mental accomplishment\* than this. The power of abstraction is based

---

\* "In default of a recognised term I have called *the perfection or virtue of the intellect* by the name of philosophy, philosophical knowledge, enlargement of mind, or illumination."—Newman's "Idea of a University," p. 125.

on the ready ability to see the same thing in a multitude of instances, or else to separate idea from idea; and both processes are the passage from thought to thought. Acuteness of perception really means rapidity of discourse—quickness in taking steps or leaps—the arriving at a given point before another mind arrives there. In one word, the excellence of human mental operation means the excellence of “discourse,” or the perfection with which the human mind accomplishes that distinguishing process by which it differs, on the one hand, from the intuition of the angel, and, on the other, from the blind instinct of the brute. There are minds in whom discourse is so slow and rudimentary, that it is difficult to perceive that they reason at all; and there are intellects in whom it is so rapid and perfect, that it seems to leap rather than go step by step; and this is the gift which we call genius. With most minds the perfection of the reasoning power depends on the education it receives. It is possible, by careful and continuous discipline, to give it strength and accuracy, as we can give strength and accuracy to any other power, physical or mental; to give it, in some degree, that rapidity, ease, and unflinching precision which marks the operations of Nature herself. For training induces a second nature.

The discipline, then, which a course of Philosophy should give, may perhaps be summarized, roughly, under three heads: it should teach distinction, abstraction, and reasoning proper. By distinction, it is meant that the study of Philosophy should inure the mind of the beginner to distinguish accurately between ideas. Hence, all the array of definitions, of divisions, and of technical terms with which the pages of a Compendium or Text-book must necessarily be filled. No one who is familiar with the style of St. Thomas of Aquin will have failed to notice the clearness, the happiness, and the luminousness, almost miraculous, with which he draws his distinctions; distinctions which often seem to settle the question definitively, as with a sudden shock or gush of light, before the argument begins. Most of the defining and dividing which is found in the Text-books has long been done to the hands of compilers, and there is little room for originality left. We may venture, however, to mention, as an example of minute and accurate defining and distinguishing (and also of much more), the splendid argument in the new volume of Father Alberto Lepidi’s “*Elementa*,” on the composition of Corporeal Substance (p. 32, seq.). It is well known to all thinkers that a definition or distinction is far from being a mere formula intended to load the memory of the learner. True and good definitions are as a spark applied to inflammable vapour; they bring into objective existence (to speak loosely)

the latent heat and light of the intellect. Once stated, they flash with the brightness of intuitions, and once seen, they become for evermore a part and a shape of mental consciousness. The second criterion of a good Text-book is its power of imparting the discipline of abstraction. The power of abstraction is more than the power of seeing only one thing at a time. It is also the power of seeing the modes of things apart from the thing, and the ideal through and in the concrete. The first step in abstraction which the beginner practically makes, may be said to be the realization of things from a "logical" point of view—that is, when he learns to consider "man," for instance, as an idea, or the composing element of a judgment; when he can consider statements of fact and opinion in the light of mere "propositions," and when he so fastens the grip of his mind on an argument as to eliminate all its sense and significance, except merely its conclusiveness as a syllogism. To the ignorant this will always seem a barren triumph, and to the beginner it is often weariness and discouragement. But it is a step which must be taken, just as the builder must dig down and build underground before his house can safely rise. The second step is taken when the learner knows how to *universalize*; when the component ideas of a concrete, under the influence of imagination and intelligence, seem to shuffle off the individual bands which limit and confine them, and to fly abroad over all the universe; when the imprisoned ideal bursts from its confinement, like the genius in the Arab legend, and swells into a category, filling all the space from earth to sky. For an elaborate exposition of what a universal is, and what it is not—how far it is in the mind, and how far it is objective—what is to be said of nominalism, conceptualism, realism—the student may be referred to Cardinal Zigliara's "*Summa Philosophica*" (vol. i. p. 316, seq.); and in the process of following that admirable argumentative statement, his mind will have a fair chance of making out, amid what at first is only fog and mist, the eternal forms of all-pervading truths. There is a third degree of abstraction, which, if it does not specifically differ in substance from the second, differs very materially in degree. It is the abstraction whereby the mind tries to isolate, if we may so speak, a spiritual or immaterial notion, so as to seize its exact nature. Thus, the philosopher tries to see the soul disembodied, the intellect at its actual contact with the presentments of the sense, the constitution of primary matter, the deepest root of the individualism of whatever is individual. These questions are called idle by Utilitarians and Positivists; but their pursuit is the very highest of the natural operations of the intellect. In their solution, the imagination, which must

always attend on intellect, is strained to the utmost; but the intellect itself is never so calm and serene as when that faithful attendant has managed for a moment to keep away intrusive images, and to fix the exact forms of some almost unseizable aspect of truth. The labour is great; it is like digging holes in the sand, which instantly fall in on every side; it is like making marks in the water or in the air, which close up again in a moment. But the result is worth the labour; and it is not too much to say that the facility of sustained reasoning depends on the facility of abstraction. Let the student read the argument of Father Harper on "the Foundation of Individual Unity in material and immaterial substances" (p. 224, seq.), and he will arise from its study a weary, perhaps, but a satisfied man; that is to say, if he disagrees with him in his conclusion, as we do, and has satisfactorily seen his way through the reasoning with which he tries to uphold it. For there is nothing that rouses the holding power of the imagination so effectually as a slight glimpse of a sophism; and opposition, whether it end in your taking up a position of your own, or in yielding yourself an unwilling captive to the logical bow and spear of your adversary, is the very best stimulus to the thorough understanding of the details of an intellectual contest.

The third mark of a good Philosophical Text-book is the degree in which it accustoms the mind of the beginner to consecutive reasoning. Distinction and abstraction are very important; but they are important chiefly as a starting-point, as a good view of the road, is important. The proper function of the intellect is "discourse," and the proper office of a Text-book is to teach the intellect to move and be at home in the work for which it is made. A mere hand-book of definitions and explanations is, therefore, of little use. Anything in the shape of a dictionary of terms, however valuable such a work may be in its proper place, is valueless as a substitute for an introduction to Philosophy. There is a tendency, at the present moment, to compress science into hand-books. These books are generally compiled on the principle of giving clear explanations and correct, but easy and popular, statements of theory; of avoiding all controversy; of omitting what is abstruse or obscure, and of rounding off the rugged edges of partially-explored ground at some expense to the sacredness of truth and fact. This feature in contemporary literature is well adapted to produce smatterers; and as long as a smattering is not passed off as something better, there is no harm in it. Small books on great subjects are almost necessarily false, by reason of their omissions, if not of their assertions; but as long as those who read them are modestly aware that they are as far from know-

ing a science because they have read a hand-book, as a man who wears a nautical costume and uses a telescope on shore is from being a sailor, such books may well be tolerated as a superior form of amusement. Philosophy in a hand-book is a worse evil than any other science so treated. No doubt, a certain amount of Philosophical information may be acquired by reading over mere assertions and brief expositions. But, in the first place, Philosophical information is, of all kinds, the most difficult to acquire by a mere statement—seeing that (as we have before insisted) the views of Philosophy never even dawn on the mind unless the mind manages to view them from within itself; and, in the second place, mere information is by no means what is intended to be acquired by a course of Philosophy. Hand-books are as little able to discipline the intellect as they are to rouse it to the using of its own eyes. The danger, on this head, is by no means imaginary. There have appeared, during the last twenty-five years, Text-books—it is not necessary to name them now—which have compressed Philosophy so ruthlessly as to be utterly unworthy to be used in the schools. And there is a tendency on the part, not of professors, but—may we say it?—sometimes of persons who have the direction of professors, so to shorten the time allowed for Philosophy as to lay the unfortunate professor under the necessity of cutting down even the scanty Text-book which he has. All the Text-books, even the most irreproachable, are obliged to be nervous about what are called so glibly “useless questions.” “*Questiones inutiles*,” says Cardinal Zigliara, “*sedulo devito*.” “Sterile and jejune questions, useless questions and vain,” says Father Lepidi, “we have let alone. . . . Into minute matters, which overtax the powers, we have not descended; questions of controversy, subtle and dark, we have not, with immoderate curiosity, discussed.” This, no doubt, is quite as it should be. But there are persons less competent to decide than these two lights of the Dominican Order as to what questions are useless and otiose. No one can pretend to draw an exact line and say that every Text-book must contain such and such questions and ignore such others. Each author has his own method, and each his own peculiarities of view and treatment. But two things may be safely said. First, it would seem to be better to leave out, bodily, a considerable part of the usual Philosophic course, than to cut down the treatment of every question to the scale of a hand-book. Omissions may be made good, and gaps filled up in happier times, if the philosophic insight is once excited, and the philosophic ardour once aroused. But a treatment which only skirts the shores or skims the surface of the great deep of abstract science, leaves



the mind unlifted and unaltered, with hardly a consciousness of what divine Philosophy can be. Secondly—and as a corollary of the same thought—we should look, even in a Text-book for philosophic arguments *de longue haleine*. We should expect that whenever a great subject comes up, or one of those root questions appears from which scholastic science springs, there should be a leisurely and elaborate demonstration. No summary, no bare statement should suffice here. The author should make it his business, by the use of all his scientific machinery—definition, distinction, syllogism on syllogism, answers to difficulties from every quarter of the compass—so to force the student to take in the whole length and breadth, height and depth, of the question, that it may become once and for ever a part of his mind's furniture—a part of his mental life. It must be confessed that most of the modern Text-books are a little unsatisfactory on this point. Cardinal Zigliara, for instance, is clear, full, and also argumentative; but his exposition of great questions seems too slightly developed. The very look of his "Summa," divided into innumerable paragraphs, each with its neat heading in thicker type, is too much after the heart of the makers of hand-books. True, this is more apparent than real, for it often happens that what looks like several independent paragraphs is really the development of one exposition. But one sometimes looks back with regret to a remote time when leisure seemed to be more abundant and Text-books longer. We have before us the "Quæstiones Philosophicæ," of Father Sylvester Mauro, S.J., written in the seventeenth century, about the time that Locke was producing the "Human Understanding." Mauro is not a strict Thomist on every point, and his three volumes, as lately reprinted with a letter of recommendation from Father Liberatore, are both encumbered with obsolete physics, and also are too long for most classes in these days. But his method is perfect. He does not waste time on definitions, annotations, monitions, or observations, but leads off, loud and bold, with a "question" or proposition. A large and substantial question once before the learner's view, he begins its elucidation, plainly stating the conclusion he is going to lead up to. Then comes the demonstration. Like the true Aristotelian he was, he seeks the demonstration in definition; he links the parts of his conclusion together by syllogisms resting on definitions; he pursues a difficult minor from one hiding-place to another, until he brings it to bay with a first principle behind it; during all this process, distinctions, explanations, elucidations of one sort or another, spring into view on every side, and, not being aimless but being imperatively required, are welcomed and scrutinized

instead of being glanced at and forgotten. Then, after a demonstration of a page or two, brought at last to a full and triumphant close, like the first part of a symphony, the work is by no means over. The second part of a classical symphony is often ushered in with curious distortions and degradations of the original theme, with sinister minor progressions and defiant contrary movements. So the "difficulties" follow the demonstration; or rather, indeed, the indication of them had already preceded, and now they are to be disposed of. In this process, fresh distinctions and new explanations are given; the proposition is taken in all round; every protesting combatant is made in the end to swear allegiance to the truth; every cloud in its dissolution and dispersal shows the light shining on some hitherto unsuspected harmony of relation; and as the dust and confusion of the contest subside, the original proposition is found to be standing solid and four-square against the sky, never again to fade out of the landscape. As examples of this, the student is referred, in Father Mauro's work, to the exposition of the composition of Corporeal Substance, to the proof that the soul is the form of the body, and to the long argument on the nature of the Intellectus Agens. It is by the patient following out and mastering such exercitations as these that the mind becomes habituated to long and sustained efforts of reasoning, whilst at the same time taking in absolute and immutable truth.

Such are the qualifications, as they occur to us, of books that are worthy to be used as Text-books in our schools of Philosophy. They have been treated chiefly from the point of view that Philosophy is a discipline or training of the mind. It is true, no doubt, that a Philosophical course is more than this, as has already been remarked. The student is expected not only to be trained but to be informed. Such questions as the composition of the material universe, the existence and the spirituality of the soul, the origin of ideas, and the objectiveness of things, afford well nigh the most important information that any intellect can acquire. As to this, however, there is not much difference among Catholic Text-books. Whether one use Zigliara or Lepidi, Gonzales or Palmieri, one may hope, in the end, to get right ideas about the world, the senses, the soul, and the Author of all things. There are one or two matters, however, connected with the question of "information" which it may be useful to mention. The statement, discussion, and refutation of erroneous systems has always occupied much room in Text-books, and given much trouble to professors and to students. It cannot be doubted that it is absolutely necessary to make the learner acquainted with the chief land-marks of Philosophical error. No one has shown himself more earnest than St. Thomas

himself in quoting and setting forth, for the purpose of refutation, the wrong or inadequate teaching of the ancients and of his own contemporaries. But it must be confessed that, in these days, there is a difficulty in dealing with such systems which St. Thomas had not to meet; and it is simply that there are so many of them—and they are so complicated and elaborate, that each one would almost require a Text-book to itself. To discuss and dismiss such names as Plato, Epicurus, Averrhoes, Spinoza, Des Cartes, Locke, and Kant in two paragraphs each, is to leave them as they were—names and nothing more; and it is, moreover, to excite the uneasy suspicion in the mind of the reader that men who have made, for good or for evil, so much noise in the world, must have something more to show for themselves than appears from the summary and off-hand criticism of the Text-book. Besides, the special value of the exposition of false systems, over and above that of mere biography, is that, by their opposition to the truth, they serve to illustrate the truth, and that, in virtue of that portion of truth to which they owe their vitality, they demonstrate the truth. It becomes very difficult, therefore, in a Text-book, to draw the line between a too superficial and a too extended treatment of the “systems” of the philosophers. Yet, all things considered, the prudent professor will probably incline to the Text-book which gives very few, but those few thoroughly representative; which avoids a crowd of names, but discusses with fairly developed completeness the “epoch-making” names which it does undertake to notice. A complete and exhaustive “dictionary” of systems is doubtless a most important *subsidiary* to the class work. Perhaps no better model of such a book could be proposed than Cousin’s translation of Tennemann’s “History of Philosophy.” But the wise compiler of a Philosophic Text will not be led into the temptation of making his book a dictionary. How nearly the best Text-writers do fall into this snare may be seen from an instructive page in the first volume of Father Gonzales. He comes to treat the intellect; and before he states and demonstrates the doctrine of St. Thomas, he gives his “tyros” twenty pages of “systems.” He says he is led to do this, not only by the desire to add to the culture of young beginners and to their zeal for truth, but also for the sake of bringing out into fuller and clearer evidence the Christian theory, which is the same thing as truth and common sense. Then, dismissing the “ancients,” he begins with Plato, and recapitulates, under fourteen separate names, what those fourteen philosophers have thought regarding the nature of the intellect, until he ends with Rosmini. Each of these master-names has a page and a fraction to himself, in which room has

to be found for a few hasty comments from the author; under each head the words "intellect," "reason," "sense," "idea," and the like, are repeated in different order and varying combination; and at the end of it all the author declares that he has no space to discuss the views given, much less to refute them, but trusts that his readers will understand what to say or think by the time he has mastered the true exposition which is now to follow. The obvious objections to such a catalogue as this are, first, that for want of a grasp of the true theory, the student will fail to take in the "points" of the systems passed in review; secondly, that the attention is a limited faculty, and that fourteen picture galleries in one morning, or fourteen Italian tours in one season, are trifles compared with fourteen systems of the intellect in one class-lesson. No stress is laid on the fact that the systems themselves are not treated fairly—that is, not treated so as to show what intellectual significance belonged to each. This could not be otherwise, in the space given. But it may be pointed out that some dozen out of the fourteen names might have been omitted as far as the "tyros" are concerned. It is not important to a beginner to learn by heart—for he cannot grasp it any other way—what Plotinus, or Leibnitz, or Cousin, or Père Gratry, or Hegel ("omissis Fichte et Schelling"), or Jacobi, or Rosmini, thought about the nature of man's intellectual powers. These names might have been reserved. Plato, Malebranche, Kant, Gioberti—these, as the author could not come down to Herbert Spencer, would have been very fair representatives of the most important schools of erroneous thought on this subject. And perhaps the plan of treating "systems" by singling out men who may in the truest sense be called leaders, or by grouping names together according to their leading views, would be practically the best that can be devised. A comparison of the way in which Cardinal Zigliara treats the same matter as that which has been referred to in Father Gonzales, will show how carefully the former distributes over a dozen articles the various theories on ideas and intellect; taking occasion from the matter in hand to discuss Fichte in one article, Des Cartes in another, Plato in a third, Rosmini in a fourth, and Locke, Kant, Cousin, respectively, in subsequent ones.

One of the most important considerations in regard to a Text-book still remains; and that is its proper length. But this is a subject on which a single word must suffice. There are only two Text-books of any weight which could be taught in a single year; and these are the "Compendium" of Father Liberatore and the "Filosofia Scolastica" of Father Cornoldi, with its Latin version by Archbishop Agostini. The former manual is

too well known to require description. Father Cornoldi has written, in the volume of 700 pages here referred to, an excellent compendious introduction to Scholastic Philosophy. To gain space he has steadily resisted the temptation to describe systems. He is anxious to impress virgin minds with the truth, and he has a firm confidence that if they are thoroughly imbued with Aristotle and St. Thomas, supplemented by Dante and St. Bonaventura, the Babel of modern thought will afterwards fail to corrupt them. This is a view for which there is much to be said. Probably, now that the "wisdom" of St. Thomas is authoritatively proposed to Catholic schools as the rule of teaching, there will be less anxiety to take up time with the incomplete systems of other thinkers. The great names will still have to be presented, but the minor ones will be passed over; and even the careers of the leaders will be used more as illustrations of principle than as monumental facts in the history of Philosophy. This may look like obscurantism; but it is not so. What great light of philosophy or science has ever stopped at every page to summarize and refute his predecessors? Not Des Cartes, not John Locke, not Kant, not Herbert Spencer. But the Catholic school has a Philosophy, and a true Philosophy. The important matter is, to teach and to learn that Philosophy. All other Philosophies are only either ancient history, or else, at best, a key to the aberrations of a generation which the Catholic Philosopher wishes to help and save. Therefore we may perhaps expect that manuals like that of Father Cornoldi will now be more or less the rule. But a year—if, indeed, his manual could be thoroughly got through in a year—will be held to be too short. It takes young students six months to gain a footing in abstract science. And now, with every new Text-book, more and more of Aristotle and St. Thomas will be set forth and explained. It is well known that the practice of the best schools is to give two years at least to the course of Philosophy; and we may take for granted that no Text-book will now adapt itself to any shorter time. The best Texts already published, as we need not say, are meant for a three years' course. It is unhappily true, that uncontrollable circumstances frequently interfere to prevent anxious heads of colleges and conscientious professors from giving a course of Philosophy of adequate length. With that, however, we have nothing to do, except to hope for the day when those circumstances may disappear.

It has been said in various forms, by the organs of English and Continental opinion, that the summons of the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris* is a summons to Catholics to cut themselves off from the intellectual life of the age they live in, and to devote

their intellectual power, not to lay hold of the world, but to cultivate a small enclosure where the chief growth is abstractions and idle questions. We can only reply to this, that time will show. If truth has any power left, we expect to tighten our hold upon the world by the study of the Thomistic Philosophy. Catholics have now a prospect of unity in abstract science such as they have not had since Erasmus began to denounce mediæval "barbarism." They ought to believe in the might and efficacy of their principles; and they do believe in them. At the same time, it is a great mistake to suppose that we are going to retire within the walls of lecture-rooms and pore exclusively over Latin texts. At first, no doubt, the revival of Scholastic Philosophy—which is not, however, so recent as some think—will chiefly affect the inner circle of Catholicism. The present generation of students, clergy, and laity, too, as far as the laity study Philosophy, must be thoroughly imbued with the "wisdom" of St. Thomas. But, little by little, we may hope to make the world listen to us. This is a result which can only come by degrees. In order to bring it about, one thing seems of the first importance, after a thorough acquisition of the master, and that is the power of transferring scholastic science into the vernacular tongue. Great names, great writers, will arise in time, when a whole generation has been cultured. A genius in Philosophic Science, as in other sciences, does not burst on the world as an isolated phenomenon. He must have been prepared and rendered possible. Before Aristotle there was a culture which began with Thales and came down to Plato; before Thomas there was a generation which culminated in Albert the Great. Professors must expound their Text-books, but must also teach their students to think and talk Philosophy in their mother tongue. They must keep a wary eye on what is going on outside their class-rooms; and without confusing beginners with the speculations of the many-volumed system-weavers, or of the brilliant theorists of the day, they must habituate them to take ground which will stand fast when the rush comes. By what degrees the public thought is to be prepared for scholastic truth, and how quickly that preparation will go on, it is not easy to say. But one thing should be an augury of success. If the name of Thomas is but slightly regarded by the non-Catholic culture of the age, the name of Aristotle is honoured and powerful. His ethical and literary treatises have long been made familiar, by admirable translation, both to students and to general readers. Last year, M. Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire finished his fine translation of the whole fourteen books of the *Metaphysics*, illustrated by a perpetual commentary, full of valuable learning, and introduced by



a long preface, not by any means so valuable, but still most useful to a student of the great master. If there is a public for the three elaborate volumes of Saint-Hilaire, as it cannot be doubted there is, it is quite certain that only real learning and a cultured style are required in order that a hearing may be obtained for any part of the Thomistic Philosophy. Father Harper's admirable volume, "*The Metaphysics of the School*," is a splendid venture in a cause that is sure to succeed some day. We call it a venture, because we have no means of knowing whether the time has come when a sufficient number of readers can be counted on for such a book. But however it is received by the outside public, for whom it is chiefly intended, it is a great acquisition to Catholic Philosophy, and a grand monument of the learning, the power, and the patience of one man. Father Harper's volume, goodly as it is, no doubt looks small compared with the *Disputations* of a Suarez; even when the five volumes of the work are finished—and we judge from certain stray indications that the second volume at least is nearly completed—they will not show very large beside those gigantic tomes which years of patient labour in peaceful Spanish convents or Italian colleges gradually built up. But, if we mistake not, every line of Father Harper's book has cost him twice or thrice the trouble which he would have had to undergo had he lived in the Spain of Suarez, or the Italy of Cardinal Gotti. He has not only made the attempt to speak Scholastic Philosophy in English, and in good, genuine English, but he has fairly and truly succeeded. Probably only those who have tried to do this can appreciate the amount of labour involved. The volume now given to the world is not a Text-book, but it is a lesson, on a great scale, on how to make Text-books useful. It treats, principally, the question of Being. The whole subject of Ontology—Being in itself and its attributes, essence, existence, unity, truth, goodness—this is the fertile country through which he leads the reader. If the volume were of no other use than to afford thoroughly worked-out examples of elaborate and sustained argumentation, it would be a treasure and a prize. But to the student it is in many other ways most valuable. It will help him to "translate" his Philosophy into current speech; it will assist him in correcting his slovenly and slipshod English; it will make him ashamed of unnecessary barbarisms; and it will not unfrequently kindle a spark of true philosophic fire by the keen and nervous "rally" of its responses, or the solid and vigorous phrasing of its demonstration. The book contains many things which might be criticized, and there are matters of some importance to which exception might be taken. But we decline to do anything more at the present moment than

to welcome a noble work. We can only recommend professors, students, and cultured readers of all sorts to study it, and to try to master it. Its pages will brace, like sea air in October, those wits which are apt to grow so flaccid in the atmosphere of "articles" and of science made easy. And then, when the book has been read and taken in, the author will, we do not doubt, be the first and the readiest to welcome intelligent criticism.

---

#### ART. VIII.—THE DISTRESS IN IRELAND.

1. *Correspondence Relative to Measures for the Relief of Distress in Ireland, 1879-80.* Presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1880.
2. *Preliminary Report on the Returns of Agricultural Produce in Ireland, in 1879, with Tables.* Presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1880.
3. *The Irish Land Question and English Public Opinion.* By R. BARRY O'BRIEN. London and Dublin. 1880.

WE are in possession of too many facts to doubt the existence in Ireland of wide-spread hunger, want, and disease. One word would express all these, but we hesitate to employ it; for "famine" has, in Ireland, such dread associations as to forbid the application of that word except to the last phase of national disaster. The culminating horrors of forty-seven are so vividly remembered, that the expression "the Irish famine" must still be appropriated to the terrible events of that year; while under the name of "distress" are included almost all degrees of suffering short of actual death from starvation. Poverty, cold, hunger, with the epidemics that always follow in their train, afflict the people throughout a wide area of the country. In many a cabin there is neither money, fuel, nor food—nay, not even bedding, or coverlet; and, too often, the broken roof exposes the diseased and emaciated inmate to the inclemency of the weather. Fever and dysentery have already appeared, and cannot fail to gather in the harvest of death with fearful rapidity, where the sole nourishment for the sick consists of a ration of Indian meal, or the fragments of half-rotten potatoes. We are told that no death has taken place from starvation; and down to the end of last year the Registrar-General has vouched for the accuracy of the statement; but if we consider how the sick-room ought to be stocked with delicate nourishment, and

how much convalescence depends upon the proper adaptation of tempting diet to the needs of the patient, we cannot ignore starvation as a preponderating factor in cases officially ascribed to various forms of disease. We have no desire to exaggerate the magnitude of Ireland's misfortune ; but it is right that our readers, who may not be familiar with the phases of Irish life, should comprehend the full extent of the prevailing distress. It must not be supposed that it merely means a few luxuries the less, for with luxuries, alas ! the poor fishermen of the Western islands, and the labourers of Donegal, Mayo, Connemara, and Kerry, have but slight acquaintance. The margin dividing many of them, even in prosperous times, from starvation or the workhouse is terribly narrow ; and when the pressure of a bad harvest comes upon them there is little room for retrenchment except in the *quantity* of their food. Potatoes are replaced by Indian meal earlier than usual, the milk or buttermilk which makes the gritty cake palatable has next to be abandoned, and finally the stock runs so low that the family is reduced to a single meal per diem. On this minimum of nutriment we believe that hundreds of thousands of the poor inhabitants of the West are now subsisting. Many have exhausted all their resources ; the stock of potatoes is consumed, the little money they possessed has been spent, all their available articles of furniture have been pawned, and the shopkeepers will no longer give them credit for the necessaries of life. For their single meal they are dependent on the dole of charity, and the anguish of uncertainty embitters their miserable lot. We have to lament not only a deficiency in food, but also a scarcity of fuel. The persistent rains of last summer made it next to impossible to dry the turf, and many a hearth is dark and cold in consequence. And such a hearth ! Let the reader picture to himself a mud cabin protected but partially by decayed thatch from the dropping of the rain, with no windows, a low door approached by a causeway between two reeking cess-pools, a damp earthen floor, a bundle of fetid straw the only bed, not a chair or table, but a bench and two or three low wooden stools, and such few domestic utensils as are absolutely necessary, and he will see the condition of a typical Irish hovel. Let him people it with a woe-begone man, his head resting on his hands, a gaunt and haggard woman, a troop of half-clad children, and too often a moaning victim of the fever in some dark corner, and the full meaning of Irish distress will become painfully apparent. This is no fanciful picture. There is not a league of the coast from Malin Head to Cape Clear which could not supply the original of the sketch. We do not conjure up these visions of misery to harrow unnecessarily the feelings of our readers, but

in the interest of truth, that they may appreciate the sufferings which their charity is called upon to alleviate. There are, indeed, few years in which the condition of certain districts along the Atlantic coast does not approach closely to what we have described. But the extreme distress lasts for only a short time, and in a few of the most desolate regions : the inhabitants suffer in silence, and are sustained by the hopes of the coming harvest. It is only when, as in the present year, such distress prevails extensively and prematurely that the great outside world hears the low moan of a starving people. We need scarcely say that we have been speaking of the poorest class in the kingdom, we might almost say in the world, men whose condition marks the zero of the social scale ; for below this depth of poverty it is impossible to sink and live. The present distress, however, extends far beyond the limits of that class whose extreme destitution we have attempted to describe. The labourer who pays in farm work the rent of his quarter acre, the cottier who supplements the produce of his holding by his earnings in the harvest fields of England, and the tenant who is generally far removed from want, are now alike involved in indistinguishable ruin.

Lest this lugubrious picture should be judged to be overwrought, we shall adduce evidence of its painful reality ; but let us first endeavour to give some idea of the geographical distribution of the distress. This is not an easy task, for there is no county of Ireland which does not suffer more or less from the failure of the crops,\* and there are few that do not contain some Union where the cry for relief has been raised. A general idea of the prevalence of actual want may be derived by drawing a line on the map from Londonderry to Cork. That line divides Ireland into almost equal areas, but the eastern half contains a million more inhabitants than the western, and its valuation is more than double, while its commerce and manufactures are vastly in excess of the less favoured moiety of the country. It is not surprising, then, that the latter should include all the districts where the suffering is most intense. If the map were shaded in proportion to the poverty of the inhabitants, so as to express to the eye the destitution of each locality, it would be found that a dense black band would border the Atlantic, that its darkness would gradually diminish from the coast inwards, and that to the east of the line which we have mentioned,

---

\* On the 29th February, twenty-nine out of the thirty-two counties in Ireland had received grants from the Mansion House Fund ; but more than half the total sum had been given to the four counties, Galway, Mayo, Cork, and Kerry.

though there might be a sombre tinge of grey, there would be but few specks of absolute blackness.

In the Report of the Local Government Board to the Irish Executive on the 18th November, 1879, the following passage occurs, which illustrates the extent of the distress at that early time :—

As the want of employment is general throughout Ireland, it is difficult at present to define the particular districts in which the labouring population are especially in need of assistance, but, taking the reports of their Inspectors, as well as the amount of the poor rates, and other circumstances into consideration, the Board think that the whole of the Province of Connaught—the County Donegal in Ulster—and the Counties Clare, Kerry, and West Riding of Cork in Munster, might at present be deemed distressed districts.

And in the list of “distressed unions,” published on the 13th January, 1880, as a Schedule to the Board of Works Notice, only four out of seventy unions lie in the eastern half of the country.

These facts give statistical confirmation of our statement that the urgent pressure of want is to be found only in the western half of Ireland. We must now present to our readers the testimony of eye-witnesses as to the nature of the distress. Mr. Mitchell Henry, M.P., an Englishman and a Protestant, who has shown what can be effected by capital and industry in the reclamation of the barren wastes of Galway, thus describes the condition of the peasantry about Kylemore :

The people (he says) have neither food, nor clothes, nor credit to buy them, nor work to earn them. Blank despair is settling down upon the district, and the efforts of the few in this locality who can give a little employment, are but as a drop in the ocean of misery around.

The same gentleman, in the debate on the Address, asserted that “if it had not been for the action of private charity, thousands of persons would have died from famine in Ireland.” A statement which was corroborated by many other Irish members, and which, indeed, no one was prepared to controvert. Numberless instances of extreme destitution were adduced, sufficient to startle demure legislators from the dream of the satisfactory working of economic laws, into the belief that something should be done to avert impending famine.

Colonel Colthurst, one of the Members for Cork, speaking in the same debate, gave a deplorable account of what he had himself seen in the parishes of East and West Skull, a barren district lying in the west of the county which he represents :

He found in each of those two parishes, not less than 300 families  
VOL. XXXIV.—NO. II. [*Third Series.*] I I

on the verge of starvation, having no food, no money, and no credit. They had been living on one meal a day, and that of Indian meal. Holding a small portion of land, they were disqualified from receiving out-door relief under the poor-law. The Workhouse was built to hold 1000, and there were only 150 inmates.

Mr. Blennerhassett, M.P., described a district in the County of Kerry containing some thirty or forty square miles of mountainous country, where a population of 20,000 had been slowly starving for several months. Why multiply instances? The same dolorous cry was sent forth by almost every Irish Member who spoke in that debate. With the policy of their demands we are not now dealing; it is enough for our present purpose that they furnished conclusive evidence of widespread destitution, and were unanimous in their appeal for Government assistance.

If we turn to another set of witnesses, the special correspondents of the various papers, English and Irish, Liberal, Conservative, and Nationalist, we find the same sad story repeated without substantial variation. Here and there we may detect some trace of imaginative colouring, or an indication that the visitor was helped to his conclusions by a judicious representation of the worst cases. An incident which occurred in the autumn of 1846 may serve to explain how this is possible. In that season of threatened famine it was deemed expedient to collect authentic information as to the failure of the crops. Accordingly, commissioners were despatched into the rural districts to make the necessary inquiries. One of these gentlemen applied to a local landowner for assistance, and the latter, too busy to accompany him in person on his rounds, handed him over to one of the principal tenants, Paddy Mahoney, who was to act as *cicerone*. "And now be sure, Paddy," said the landlord, "to show this gentleman from the Government over the land, and tell him everything you know." With obsequious bows, and an expression of the utmost stolidity, Paddy promised obedience to the minute directions which he received. No sooner, however, had he quitted the room with the Saxon visitor, than he darted back, the assumed veil of stolidity swept off, his grey eyes sparkling with malicious roguery, every line in his face expressive of fun and cunning, and whispered to his landlord—"Wisha, yer honor, is it the truth I'll tell him, or will I make it a little bit worse?" In spite of the indignant reply which he received, it is said that the reports of that district were not easily recognised by the inhabitants when they were subsequently published by "the gentleman from the Government."

But we believe that, except in perhaps a few cases, the special correspondents visited really representative villages, and dis-



passionately described the scenes of suffering which they witnessed ; and that their reports may, therefore, be accepted as substantially accurate accounts of the condition of the country. The gratitude of Ireland is, at any rate, due to them for the extensive publication of her woes, and advertisement of her necessities.

There is still another source of information to which we turn with the greatest confidence, the Reports of the Local Relief Committees. They are furnished by persons well acquainted with each district, under the full sense of responsibility, and controlled by the necessity of keeping rigidly accurate accounts of their expenditure, and by the occasional visits of inspectors from the central committees. The extent of distress revealed by these reports seems to increase day by day ; and therefore the figures which we give cannot be taken as representing more than the condition of the districts to which they refer towards the end of February. From the Relief Committee in Donegal we learn that there were in that county 12,700 families, or 66,000 persons in actual want, and in receipt of relief. These numbers represent one-third of the total population. An equally high rate of destitution prevailed in some parts of Mayo ; for example, there were 10,000 cases of urgent distress in Claremorris, and 5613 persons had been relieved during one week in Castlebar ; while 850 families were destitute in Loughrea (Co. Galway) ; 2000 families were in great distress in Manorhamilton (Co. Leitrim) ; and no less than 4000 persons in the immediate vicinity of Athlone. These instances might be increased almost indefinitely ; we shall add but one taken from the extreme south-west of the County of Cork. The Local Committee of Castletown, Berehaven, write :—

Hundreds of families that did not need relief three weeks ago are now wildly crying to the Committee for food, and so persistent are they in their appeals, that it is impossible to distribute to them the rations of meal without the assistance of the police. Bere Island has a population of about one thousand, of whom twenty-two families, or about 110 individuals, are supposed to be able to live without relief for one month.\*

This approaches very near to famine ; and we can only hope that its development will be stayed by some means, whether by the efforts of private charity, or the organized action of the Government.

There is one circumstance which cannot fail to astonish the English reader who is but partially acquainted with Irish life, and render him sceptical as to the existence of actual want—

---

\* "Freeman's Journal," Feb. 18, 1880.

namely, that the workhouses are not full. Although there is at the present time an increase of some 20,000 persons in receipt of Poor Law Relief, as compared with the same period of last year, yet the vast establishments which offer gratuitous food and shelter to the destitute are still far from being fully occupied. How is this fact consistent with the misery which we have described? Nothing is more characteristic of the Celt than his detestation of becoming a pauper. It involves social degradation, the disruption of his family, the loss of personal liberty, and separation from the home, to which, though wretched, he clings with extraordinary devotion. Hunger, cold and nakedness cannot always conquer his natural repugnance to the livery of destitution, and the discipline of the detested "House;" and many a man deliberately faces the horrors of slow starvation rather than seek an asylum where he is separated from all he loves. There are two conditions, moreover, which limit the efficacy of the Poor Law in dealing with a time of trial like the present; one is that outdoor relief cannot be given to the able-bodied while there is room for them in the workhouse; the other precludes the holder of more than a rood of land from obtaining such relief. This "quarter acre clause" especially tends to withdraw from the most deserving the only form of assistance which they can avail themselves of, and to place the poverty-stricken occupier of a little patch of land in the predicament of either surrendering his holding for ever, or being excluded from all relief. It is these small holders who at present swell the lists of distress, and are most worthy of assistance, since by a little timely aid they may be able to tide over the crisis of adversity.

If we turn from the actual condition of the people to the proximate cause of this distress, we find it fully accounted for in the Agricultural Returns prefixed to this Article. Accompanying these Returns is a Meteorological Report disclosing such a condition of the elements during 1879 as explains the disastrous harvest. We learn that the mean temperature of every one of the first nine months of the year was considerably below the average, while the amount of cloud and the rain-fall were in corresponding excess. In February, June, and July, the quantity of rain was double what the observations of years would lead us to expect; and thus wet and cold combined their malignant influences to thwart the bountiful efforts of Nature. The result of these atmospheric conditions is a row of figures which are simply appalling. The estimated produce of every crop shows an alarming deficiency. Potatoes, still the staple food of a large proportion of the population, are set down as 1,113,676 tons, against 2,526,504 tons in 1878; and of turnips

there are but 2,057,804 tons as compared with 4,686,226 tons. In each of these cases the produce is less than half what it was in the preceding year. In fact, the yield of potatoes is only about one-third of the average. The cereal crops have also suffered, though not to so great an extent. The loss in money value to the country from this unfavourable harvest is estimated at upwards of ten millions sterling as compared with 1878—a stupendous loss for so poor a country as Ireland to be called upon to bear in one year! The Registrar-General writes:

The great bulk of the money loss is on the potato crop, in which the diminution of value is 4,238,484*l.* as compared with 1878, and 5,771,927*l.* as compared with the average value of the crops for ten years.

This loss is distributed very evenly over the entire country; but its effect has been only to impoverish the usually prosperous counties, while it has reduced to starvation those districts entirely dependent on this precarious article of food.

The reader who appreciates these figures at their full value will no longer doubt the existence of real distress; but may possibly feel surprise that it is not more widely spread and more disastrous in its results, especially if he remembers that Ireland is almost wholly dependent upon her agricultural produce for the maintenance of her population. England was deluged by the same floods of rain: the sun displayed no partiality for her green and sodden corn, and when the story of her harvest comes to be written it will, we believe, be not more encouraging than that of Ireland. How comes it that what is ruin to one country is only comparative discomfort to the other? The answer is that agriculture is Ireland's sole resource, while in England it is only one of several branches of national revenue. A purely agricultural country must produce food enough to support its inhabitants, else they must starve or beg. If either England or Ireland had been cut off last autumn from all communication with the rest of the world, and the blockade effectively maintained till next harvest, famine must inevitably have resulted, and a large number of the inhabitants perished through starvation. Now, this represents the normal condition of England. She is the workshop of the world, not its granary; and from the ends of the earth the food of her children is supplied in exchange for manufactures which depend equally upon her industry and her wonderful subterranean resources. Mines beneath the surface, and factories raised upon it contribute equally with her corn and cattle to support her population. She possesses the ample accommodation of a house built in three storeys. Poor Ireland, however, has nothing but her superficial vesture. In some

counties, indeed, coal is worked ; but the total supply is less than one-thousandth part of that produced annually by England. In like manner her copper, lead, and iron bear a completely insignificant proportion to the quantities extracted from English mines. On the wild shores of Roaring Water Bay—one of the poorest districts in Ireland—gold is mixed with the quartz, and the outcrop of copper ore is so tempting as to have lured many speculators to their ruin. The gold does not pay for crushing the quartz, the copper lodes fade away as the explorer follows them into the bowels of the earth, so that the mines have to be abandoned, or worked at a rapidly diminishing rate of profit. The manufactures of Ireland offer an equally painful contrast. Linen, indeed, may be regarded as an exception ; for the export value of this commodity amounts annually to a very large sum ; but this is almost confined to the Province of Ulster, and may in part account for its relative prosperity. Two hundred years ago the woollen trade was so flourishing that Irish wools enjoyed a high reputation all over Europe. Now it furnishes employment to less than 2000 persons. Almost all the exports consist of bacon, butter, and live stock—that is to say, of agricultural produce. These must pay not only for what she imports, but also for her quota towards the imperial expenditure, and the interest upon English capital invested in her railways and other public works. It is only what is left after these deductions that is available for the support of her population.

Ireland is, then, a purely agricultural country ; and her welfare may be said to depend on the thermometer and the rain-gauge. In such a country there is manifestly a limit to the number of persons who can obtain food from the soil. It is not for the well-being of society that the actual number should closely approach that limit ; for a multitude of discontented, under-fed peasants, ever engaged in a bitter struggle for mere existence, can scarcely be regarded as constituting a happy community. It would be well if the population were determined by the *minimum* of production, leaving a margin of prosperity in favourable years ; while in seasons of disaster like the present they could, at all events, support life without the aid of international charity.

The crop, too, on which they stake their existence is essentially a precarious one. If we cast our eyes down the line of figures representing the produce of that crop for the last twenty years, we cannot fail to be struck by its extraordinary vicissitudes. Four times in that period has it produced upwards of four million tons, four times has it fallen below *half* that quantity. And it is the food of the people, the necessary support of life which is thus the sport of the elements ! To rely

wholly, or chiefly, on this treacherous root is to gamble for human lives; and is altogether indefensible since the experience of that terrible year (1846) when the entire sustenance of nearly nine millions of people was consumed in a single night. The angel of death seemed to have passed over the land; the flowering garden became a mass of blackened and putrid vegetation; the noxious odour tainted every breath of wind; and on the faces of the peasantry was written the mournful presage of impending famine.

It is a mischievous illusion that the people of Ireland were before that signal visitation prosperous and comfortable. The Duke of Wellington, speaking in the House of Lords in 1838 on the Poor Law Bill, stated:

That from the year 1806, down to the present time, a year has not passed in which the Government have not been called on to give assistance to relieve the poverty and distress which prevailed in Ireland.

In 1823, and again in 1831, famine occurred, and large sums of money were granted by Parliament, and subscribed by individuals to save the people from starvation; and in almost every year from 1835 there had been such a failure as to produce local distress. Since that time considerable changes have been effected in the condition of the country. The potato has been partially replaced by less remunerative, but also less hazardous crops; while the population has dwindled from nine to little more than five millions. Still, we fear that the poorer districts are, even at the present time, too densely populated. A high authority has stated that in some parts of the West of Ireland there are three times as many people as the soil can be legitimately expected to support. We believe this to be by no means an extravagant estimate. While we feel the deepest sympathy with these poor cottiers, we should wish to see their numbers gradually diminished, so that squalid poverty might be replaced by cottages, gardens, well-kept farms, and comfortable living. Any change in this respect must necessarily be of slow growth, and must depend upon the diffusion of a higher standard of comfort, and the cultivation of taste, rather than upon direct efforts for the improvement of the material condition of the people.

We now return to the crying necessity of the hour, and the measures which have been taken for its relief; and we must, in the first place, consider what the Government has done, and how far its policy is worthy of approval. If they have erred, it has not been from ignorance of the condition of the country, which was repeatedly and earnestly brought under the notice of

the authorities by the most influential persons. The Catholic Bishops, the Irish Members of Parliament, Boards of Guardians throughout the country—all told the same tale; and, even if they were inclined to disregard such evidence, the Report of the Local Government Board on the 28th October placed the Irish Executive in full privy with the wants of the people. The potato crop is described in that Report "as almost everywhere deficient in quantity, inferior in quality, and affected by blight, and not likely to be more than half an average crop." The general harvest, with the exception of oats, "appeared to be inferior, and the crop deficient;" and as to the supply of turf, the Board concludes that "it is everywhere greatly deficient, and much suffering and sickness is anticipated from this cause." On the general condition of the country the statements were not more auspicious. The prices of cattle were low, the once-flourishing kelp trade was almost extinct, the banks refused further credit, the farmers were deeply in debt to money-lenders and shopkeepers, and there was already an alarming increase in the number of persons receiving Poor-Law Relief. The action of the Government was reduced to the very minimum of interference. A circular was sent to all the Boards of Guardians warning them to make due provision for "the possible contingencies of the season;" and the Board of Works sought to stimulate private expenditure by the offer of loans on advantageous terms: they were not such, however, as to procure a general rush for the division of spoil, and on the 12th January a further notice offered a more alluring bait. The total remission of interest for two years, and a subsequent rate of only one per cent. produced the desired effect; and before the 29th of February, the time limited for the expiration of the notice, applications had been received for advances to a far larger amount than the Government will probably sanction.

Another expedient was adopted to induce the country to exert itself for its own support. Extraordinary Baronial Sessions were called together for the purpose of "presenting" any useful engineering works which could be immediately undertaken with advantage; and, in order to relieve the Baronies from all financial difficulty, loans were, at the same time, offered by the Government on very favourable terms both as to interest and time of repayment. But the constitution of the bodies to whom the initiation of these works has been entrusted, is such as to lead us to suppose that the powers conferred will be but slightly made use of. The magistrates and associated cess-payers represent the interests of *property*; and relieving distress by presentment—for that is what is intended—amounts to a further tax on the already heavily-burthened land. Moreover,



after an application has been approved of by the Presentment Sessions, it has still to run the gauntlet of official criticism. It must be sanctioned by the Board of Works on financial grounds, and by the Executive Government as pertaining to a sufficiently distressed district. It is to be hoped that the "survival of the fittest" may apply in this case, and that after three expurgations jobbery and corruption may be banished from these works.

No one will accuse the Government of having done too much; and its position has been strictly one of reserve while other agencies were found capable of sustaining the conflict. Indeed, the loans which have been authorised have not yet filtered, even in the minutest drops, into the empty pockets of the labourers. The machinery of the Improvement Acts and Presentment Sessions is somewhat slow in being set in motion. Preliminary surveys, plans, and estimates have to be made and duly approved before a single instalment becomes available for the relief of the district; and it must be admitted that but for private charity many deaths from starvation would have assuredly taken place.

Cautious as the action of the Government undoubtedly was, it was nevertheless in excess of their powers; and they had accordingly, on the meeting of Parliament, to apply for "a covering authority." The Relief Bill, which was introduced partly to indemnify for the past, partly to justify future action on the same lines, contained some important provisions which it is necessary briefly to mention. This measure, which obtained the Royal assent on the 15th of March amends the Poor Law by suspending "the Gregory" clause during the present year, thus enabling the Guardians to administer outdoor relief in food and fuel to occupiers of land; and it also empowers them, with the sanction of the Local Government Board, to borrow money on the credit of the rates of distressed electoral divisions. It also defines the terms on which Government Loans are to be granted to individuals and public bodies; but the part of the Act which now more immediately concerns us is that which deals with the financial aspect of the question. A large, if not a highly enlightened, part of the community regard "the Government" very much in the light of those sullen but obedient genii who play so prominent a part in the "Arabian Nights." The friction of a ring, or the utterance of a mystic word, compels the attendance of the potent spirit, who is always able to produce unlimited stores of wealth without impoverishing any one. The analogy, we fear, extends no farther than the formality which is requisite in approaching the treasuries of both. The true position of the Government is that of trustees of the national funds, and however liberally the

expression "public good" may be interpreted, yet it is only in cases of extreme necessity and as a last resort that imperial funds should be devoted to the relief of local distress. That the circumstances in Ireland amounted to a case of extreme necessity, and justified a departure from the ordinary rules, is admitted as fully by a gift of interest as by the expenditure of capital. In order to keep the people from starving, work or food had to be provided, but no one was willing to borrow at the ordinary rates. Who was then to pay the difference? Under normal conditions the necessary moneys should be provided, as they were, in 1863, for the Lancashire operatives, out of the Consolidated Fund. But the disendowment of the Irish Church has perplexed the country with a fund which calls aloud for appropriation. She has come in for a fortune, and does not know how to spend it. The Parliament that created it laid down the rule that it should be used "for the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, yet not so as to cancel or impair the obligations now attached to property under the Acts for the relief of the poor." Of course this is not a law to all future Parliaments. It has been already twice beneficently violated by giving 1,000,000*l.* to intermediate education, and 1,300,000*l.* for pensions to national school teachers; and it is indeed difficult to imagine a case strictly satisfying both the positive and the negative requirements of the clause. But whatever purpose this money is devoted to should be a permanent benefit to the country, a monument for all time. To seize it for transitory relief in the first season of scarcity is to misappropriate for the benefit of one generation the inalienable property of the nation. We shall have a word to say as to the application of this fund a little later on; but now we merely protest against its being charged with the cost of relieving the present distress—for, after being cleared of all the jugglery of finance, that is what is proposed by the Government measure. The Church Commissioners are to advance three-quarters of a million at low interest, but they, being merely reversioners after the lives of the existing incumbents, must raise the money themselves by ecclesiastical post obits. To facilitate the transaction the National Debt Commissioners are empowered to lend the requisite funds at the market rate; so that in the result the loss of interest is thrown upon the Church surplus. It may seem a small matter to dispute about; but the maxim *de minimis non curat lex* is a dangerous one in politics, and the precedent may be appealed to at some future time to justify improvident dispositions of the fund.

We pass with great pleasure from the description of the Government precautions to the noble efforts of private charity.

Not only in Ireland and England have large subscriptions been raised, but in almost every country in the world has the cry of suffering been heard, and responded to with generous sympathy. The United States and Canada have, both by public grants and private munificence, come forward with enthusiasm; Australia and New Zealand have sent to the Mansion House Fund 55,570*l.*; India and the Cape of Good Hope have not been backward; in a word, wherever the English language is spoken the suffering poor of Ireland have been charitably remembered. Nor has the feeling been confined within the limits of race and language; Catholic France has shown, as might have been expected, the most lively sympathy with Catholic Ireland; and special committees have been organized in Paris and other cities for the collection of subscriptions.

Independently of the money disbursed unofficially by the bishops and clergy as the almoners of private charity, the sum that has been raised in less than two months from all sources amounts to 359,000*l.* In the receipt and distribution of this large fund no fewer than four charitable organizations are already engaged; and it is evident that unless the most stringent precautions are observed, there is great danger in this independent action of demoralizing the people by indiscriminate charity.

It was only one week before Christmas that the letter of the Duchess of Marlborough appeared in the *Times*, and startled all England by begging for subscriptions, in the most earnest terms, for the relief of distress. Her committee was organized almost immediately, and shortly afterwards another committee was constituted under the Presidency of the Lord Mayor of Dublin. These two bodies seem to have done as much as could be expected by interchanging reports to avert the dangers of a dual system; and they deserve the highest praise for the energy with which they entered upon the noble rivalry of good works. Up to the 4th of March 78,315*l.* had been received by the Duchess of Marlborough and 100,647*l.* by the Lord Mayor; and of these sums, about half had been expended in grants to distressed districts. Although the mode of operation of these two committees is dissimilar in some details, the general plans on which they proceed are alike in these respects, that they work through local committees, and that relief is only furnished in food, fuel, and clothing. The Duchess of Marlborough's Committee is in communication with fifty central committees, and they again have numerous sub-committees in each district. The Mansion House Committee, on the contrary, communicates directly with its parish committees, which are six hundred in number. It may be safely asserted that thousands of the inhabitants of the West owe their lives to the benevolent and

timely intervention of these two bodies. This consolatory reflection and the ample recognition which their labours receive in Ireland must be an abundant compensation for the malignant attacks to which they have recently been exposed in America. We do not wish to dwell on this painful episode, nor have we sufficiently authentic accounts before us to say what measure of success has attended the attempt to raise a mixed fund for relief and agitation.

If charity has not altogether escaped from political animosities, it has with one exception avoided sectarian strife. The Catholic and Protestant Archbishops of Dublin meet at the Board of the Mansion House Committee; the parish priest and the rector vie with each other in the endeavour to feed the hungry, and neither dreams of insisting on a doctrinal qualification for the receipt of meal. The exception to which we allude occurred in one of the most needy spots in Ireland, Clifden, in the County of Galway, and was due to the uncompromising action of the members of the Church Mission Society. In that wretched district, where thousands of poor creatures did not know where to look for their next meal, the Duchess of Marlborough was constrained to dissolve her committee because the members of the Church Missions refused to give a pledge that they would not use the funds for proselytizing purposes. It is said that under the pressure of a common peril the fiercest animals lay aside their habitual animosities, and couch together in perfect peace. But it seems that the Irish Church Missionaries possess a stock of sectarian ferocity which is not exhausted by famine and desolation; in fact, these constitute their season of harvest, or, to use the words of the rector of Clifden himself, it is a time "so encouraging in the prospects of Missionary enterprise" that they feel bound to redouble their exertions. To offer food and false doctrine to a famishing peasant on condition of his accepting both or neither, differs in no respect from the alternative presented to the Roman Martyrs of death or sacrifice. It is only in the "encouraging times" of general starvation that a few proselytes are won over to a show of conformity. "If the potatoes grow again, 'tis the sheep will be kept there," was the remark of a Cape Clear fisherman, pointing to a neat church which had been built in the island during the famine years. The rude phrase of the boatman expresses the general feeling of the people. There is no name more odious in the ears of an Irishman than "souper," the familiar term by which they stigmatize one who changes his religion for gastronomical reasons.

We have enumerated the principal measures which have, up to the present time, been taken for the relief of distress; and

taking into account that Ireland has lost ten millions sterling through the deficiency of the last harvest, it is evident that those measures must still leave a great void to be supplied ; and that it is too probable that the season of trial has not yet attained to its maximum of severity. There are two sources of grave uneasiness in the present condition of the country. One, that labour may be diverted from the ordinary agricultural operations by the superior attractions of immediate wages on the works that are about to be undertaken ; the other, that a deficiency in seed may leave large tracts of ground absolutely unproductive in the next harvest. But even if the coming autumn should furnish an abundant supply of food, it will not be available until the middle of August. In the meantime the people have to rely upon extraneous aid. The labourers, indeed, might support themselves on their earnings for the next few months, if the farmers were in a position to pay wages ; but the smaller class of farmers, and those labourers who give work in return for their crop, cannot look for assistance in this direction. It is, therefore, to be feared, that the months of June and July will see even more widespread destitution than now prevails. It would be well that the problem of supplying the necessities of the people during those months should be boldly faced. We learn from the past ; our own blunders instruct the future ; and one lesson which has been taught by the former famine is that relief works, that is to say, public works undertaken without regard to their utility, but merely for the purpose of applying a labour test for the receipt of relief, are a fatal mistake. In condemnation of them it is almost sufficient to point out that where want is spread over the whole country, centres of industry are of no avail. The relief must be brought to each man's door, or at least within easy reach. In 1847 numbers perished on the roads in seeking to reach the works from their distant homes ; and their daily journeys must have been a fearful tax on their enfeebled frames. The labour of famine-stricken men is a mockery, and whether the work is executed by task or by contract, it fails to give efficient relief to the really destitute. The plan which successfully grappled with the terrible crisis of 1847 consisted in the gratuitous administration of food by local committees : the expenses being defrayed by the rates, by free grants from the Treasury in cases of urgent necessity, and by private subscriptions. By these means nearly 3,000,000 persons were daily fed from the closing of the relief works in April to the middle of August. If our mournful anticipations should prove correct, some such scheme will, we fear, have to be now adopted ; but, of course, not to the same extent as was necessary on the former occasion.

We have attempted to describe the nature and extent of the present distress, and the measures which have been taken for its alleviation; but we should be fulfilling only part of our duty if we refrained from considering the more permanent evils from which Ireland suffers. The scanty harvest of 1879 will be soon forgotten, but the causes which have produced poverty, discontent, and disloyalty in the past still threaten the future.

The Celt has a retentive memory for wrongs, and the confiscations, oppressions, and legislative outrages of centuries are still a living reality to his mind.\* Inflammatory anniversaries are celebrated with an ardour that too frequently terminates in bloodshed; and the relations of landlord and tenant are embittered by political agitation.

Nearly three hundred years ago the poet Spenser wrote of Ireland the following sentence:—

There have beene divers good plottes devised, and wise Counsell  
cast allready about reformation of that realme; but they say, it is the  
fatall desteny of that land, that noe purposes, whatsoever are meant  
for her good, will prosper or take good effect.

But as the "good plottes" consisted for the most part in a policy of extermination, and keeping "still the souldiours on theyr necke," perhaps we ought not to be surprised at their want of success. Centuries of misgovernment by a dominant class are still producing their baleful fruit; and, though justice and toleration are now the guiding principles of English rule, we must remember that the change has only been effected in comparatively recent times. We do not believe in any sudden transformation to a condition of peace and prosperity being produced by legislative measures. Social changes are of slow growth, especially in the direction of improvement; yet our hope for Ireland rests altogether on the establishment of healthy relations between the classes of society, and a wise oblivion of the past. Never in the history of the country did such a consummation seem more remote. In the autumn of last year Mr. Parnell and other members of Parliament commenced a systematic campaign against the rights of property. Meetings were convened in almost every county of Ireland, and were largely attended by the neighbouring peasantry. The avowed purpose of this vehement agitation was to encourage the tenants to resist the payment of "unjust rents;" but, as the tenant himself was to be the judge of what was "unjust," it is not surprising that the more simple doctrine of not paying *any* rent met with very general approval.

---

\* For a resumé of Ireland's grievances in the past, see "The Irish Land Question and English Public Opinion."



We would not, in condemning this anti-rent agitation, be understood as questioning the right of all classes to assemble in a peaceable and orderly manner for the representation of their grievances: but a serious responsibility is incurred by those who initiate such a movement among an excitable people, and stimulate their passions almost to madness by rhetorical absurdities. Some of Mr. Parnell's hearers seem clearly to have "burst the curb," and put their own interpretation upon his advice, "to keep a firm grip of their homesteads" by shouting, "Shoot the landlords," "Give them an ounce of lead," and other equally significant phrases. Nothing is more melancholy in the history of this anti-rent movement than the toleration which these utterances met with, not only among the crowd, but also on the platform. On one occasion, indeed, the chairman interposed to deprecate a resort to violence, when the speaker, Mr. Killen, is reported to have replied, "I do not recommend force, but I would be glad to see every peasant carrying a rifle, and knowing how to use it." At another meeting Mr. Parnell is credited with the astounding explosion—"I am not in favour of shooting landlords, but lead proved very useful once before, and the time might come when it would again." This dangerous seed was sown broadcast over the country; how can we avoid the conclusion that the plentiful crop of agrarian outrages which shortly followed was in truth its natural growth? The pernicious nature of the doctrines deliberately promulgated over and over again at these meetings may be understood from one or two extracts. "Rent" is described as "in any circumstances, in prosperous times or bad times, an unjust and immoral tax upon the industry of the people." Another speaker recommended them "to pay no one—except the shopkeepers whom they might want again;" and at the Tipperary meeting Mr. Parnell is reported to have said:

It was, therefore, incumbent on them to stand together, and ask for a reasonable reduction of rent; and if such reasonable reduction were not granted, it was their duty to pay no rent at all. (A voice:—"That's coming to it." Laughter.) If they were determined, they had the game in their own hands. Let them band together and strengthen those among them who were weak, and let them organize themselves, and refuse to take farms from which tenants had been evicted. Providence was on their side, and even the elements that day were fighting for them. (Loud applause.)

The allusion in the last sentence was to the torrents of rain which were then falling; and it is certainly an extraordinary example of wrong-headedness that an assemblage should be found capable of cheering the destruction of their harvest. It will be no surprise to our readers to learn that the Communistic

doctrines of the anti-rent agitation met with the disapproval of the Catholic Hierarchy. The following passage is extracted from a pastoral of the Archbishop of Dublin, which was read in the churches of that city on the 23rd November:—

It has pleased Divine Providence to visit our country with a succession of unfavourable harvests, resulting in deep distress in many parts of the land. No class in Ireland will escape the effects of this visitation, and all must be prepared to take their part in bearing the common burthen. But we must take care not to render these trials intolerable, driving God from our side by the violation of His eternal law. Unfortunately, men proclaiming their sympathy for the people in their deep distress are going through the country disseminating doctrines, which, pushed to their logical conclusion, would strike at the root of that good faith and mutual confidence which are the foundation of social life. These doctrines have already produced their evil results. The enemies of our people employ them as arguments against our just demands for aid. Half-hearted friends are driven away in despair, and real friends of the people are weakened in their advocacy of the rights of the country. Very reverend fathers, while standing forward to support our flocks in this their dark hour of distress, we must not fear to raise our voices to warn them against the results of faults or mistakes. Our principle must be to give to Cæsar what Cæsar justly claims, else we cannot give to God what God commands. If just debts fairly demanded be not honestly discharged, a principle fatal to the prosperity of our country will be established; and, sooner or later, it will recoil on the heads of those who to-day may seem to be gainers by its adoption. But let us pray that the day may be far distant, when Irishmen, who in olden times were renowned for their love of impartial justice, should set to the world an example of faith disregarded.

These noble words must have struck a chord in the hearts of many, and recalled them to a correct judgment of the immoral doctrines that they had listened to. If Irishmen would conform to this teaching, and live up to their glorious traditions of faith and purity, the day could not be far distant that would dawn upon a land of comfort and contentment.

Over and above the distinctive doctrine of the "repudiation of rent," we find in the resolutions passed at these land meetings two distinct schemes for the settlement of the Irish land question—"fixity of tenure" and "peasant proprietors." The latter is not to be confounded with the moderate and constitutional measure which we shall presently discuss, but is meant to be a wholesale transfer to the tenant, upon highly favourable terms, of the interest of the landlord; so that the present occupier may be converted into the *sole* owner of the land. It is necessary briefly to advert to these two proposals, as they have become catchwords of party, and are flippantly

made use of by many persons who do not appreciate the difficulties with which the schemes are beset. We shall show that they are impracticable and unjust, or rather that they are impracticable because they are unjust.

"Fixity of tenure" means that the tenant is not to be evicted from his holding so long as he pays his rent. But, what rent? Not that which he is at present liable to pay. The last thing which the agitators desire is fixity at the present rent: it must first be determined, once and for ever, at a *reasonable* figure. This is the insuperable difficulty: who is to determine what is \*reasonable? Not the parties to the contract, for they have already agreed,<sup>1</sup> *ex hypothesi*, upon an unreasonable amount; not one of them alone, for that would be to abolish contract altogether; and the most paternal Government could scarcely undertake the office of land valuer between the parties. They may certainly adopt the machinery of arbitration, but that requires no legislative license. The essential part of a contract is that it is voluntary; and no enactment can enlarge the rights of absolute freedom. If it imposes limitations, it must be to the prejudice of one side or the other. But we do not hesitate to affirm that the Irish tenant does at the present day practically enjoy "fixity of tenure" at the rent which he has contracted to pay. The Land Act of 1870 has placed so heavy a fine on capricious evictions, that the landlords could not afford to put in force the power, which is nominally theirs, of recovering possession, except for non-payment of rent. Compensation for disturbance, amounting in some cases to seven years' rent, has conferred on the occupier a practical freehold. The advocates of "fixity of tenure" at a *fair* rent are driven to the humiliating confession that under the pressure of extraordinary competition the tenant will agree to pay a rent which he knows he cannot pay, and which he is determined to withhold; and that he is not morally bound to carry out a contract which was the result of extortion. The weak side of this contention is, that the tenant wishes to retain the advantage, while he repudiates the burthen of the contract—to keep possession, and get rid of the rent.

Tenant-right is a subject closely connected with "fixity of tenure." Under the Ulster custom, a tenant, though nominally holding from year to year, possesses an interest in his farm which occasionally fetches in the market as much as the value of the fee-simple. He is, in a sense, joint owner with his landlord. The full dominion over the land can only be acquired by paying purchase-money to the landlord for his rent, and to the tenant for his occupancy. Now, we wish to point out that, although this is a great gain to the particular tenant who first acquires the right, it is no permanent advantage to the subsequent

occupiers. When the farm changes hands, the incoming tenant has to pay a large sum to his predecessor, and is in a worse position than if he had retained his capital and paid a higher rent. Too frequently he has raised the requisite fine through the agency of usurers, and enters upon the cultivation of his farm, not only without capital, but encumbered with an oppressive load of debt.

Fixity of tenure is, indeed, to the most ardent spirits, but another name for fixity of landlords, and they accordingly embrace the scheme for establishing through the length and breadth of Ireland a system of peasant proprietors. This is the crowning absurdity of these revolutionary agitators. The landlords, or as they prefer to say "landlordism" (adding one more to the long list of terrible "isms") must be completely eradicated. The peasant has a natural right to live in the country where he was born, and the cultivator shall be the sole proprietor of the soil which he tills. Get rid of "landlordism" and all will go well. It matters little by what agency it is effected, so that it is done quickly and thoroughly. But we miss in this scheme any consideration for the labourer, who certainly possesses an equal right with the tenant to live in the country of his birth, and to seize his share of the confiscated interests. Curious questions might also arise after a time, in the event of the new proprietors letting the lands which they acquired. We suspect that they would bitterly resent a second transfer of the soil to the occupiers who had derived title for themselves. The means by which this revolution is to be effected vary according to the more or less "advanced" opinions of its advocates. Some would bid the landlords begone! and be thankful for having been permitted so long to enjoy their ill-gotten revenues; others, more moderate, would merely give them notice to quit on receipt of a fair compensation. How that compensation should be provided is a financial problem which weighs lightly on these upholders of the rights of man. A State loan on a magnificent scale to buy out the "tyrants" could, they think, be easily raised. It would be repaid by the new proprietors in a term of years, or it might even be presented to them as a free gift.

Hope sickens with extravagance,

and it is well-nigh sick unto death in the hearts of Ireland's practical friends, when they hear such monstrous absurdities advocated as feasible plans.

There are many persons who attribute to the operation of the Land Laws all the agrarian evils from which the country suffers; yet we find that in England, where the laws are not more favourable to the tenant, threatening notices, outrages

and murders, are not familiar incidents of tenure. No human law can be devised to make men really just in all the relations of life. The world would be scarcely bearable if every one acted up to the extreme limit of his legal rights, and this is especially true in the case of landlords. We believe that in the vast majority of cases where the landlord is considerate, and the tenant industrious, the most amicable feelings subsist between them. An example of how well the present system may work under favourable circumstances was recently supplied by the special correspondent of the *Times*, in a letter published in that journal on the 6th February last. It is descriptive of the prize farm of Charles Sampey in the County Roscommon. The careful husbandry, the comfortable homestead, the neat garden, and the thrifty habits of the occupier are set forth in graphic detail; but what is most insisted on is that it has all been created by his own industry—"By thirty years of hard work he dug away peat for fuel from off the entire surface of what is now his farm, removing in most places a thickness of five feet which covered the area, including the present site of his house, buildings and garden."

It would, indeed, be an outrage on all our feelings of natural justice if a landlord, after watching the gradual creation of a fertile soil through the labour of a tenant, were to wrest it from him under colour of a legal right. But in the case which we have described, the tenant reposed confidence in the honour of his landlord, and his rent remains at 3*l.* per annum, the sum at which it was originally fixed. If all Irish tenants were as thrifty and industrious as Charles Sampey, and if all landlords were as just as his, we should hear very little of "fixity of tenure" or "rents by arbitration." For the general diffusion of such happy relations we can only look to time, and such social measures as will gradually ameliorate the condition of the tenant.

One of the most serious obstacles to a happy understanding between landlord and tenant in Ireland is the prevalence of absenteeism. It will be readily admitted that, from an economical or political point of view, no injury is done to the nation as a whole by territorial revenues being expended in a remote province, or even in the metropolis of the kingdom; and that to compel every landowner to reside in the parish where his property is situate would be an act of impracticable tyranny. But the remedy of the evil is one thing, its recognition as a powerful factor in augmenting social animosity is another. The classes of society are knit together by something stronger than mere legal obligation. In too many instances in Ireland the landlord's connection with his property is confined to the pay-

ment of rates, and the receipt of rents through an agent. His tenants are to him no more than his shares in a company, the fluctuations of their harvests than good or bad traffic returns. Their struggle for life is translated into a balance sheet, and its unfavourable figures are a source of annoyance not a stimulus to action. He is beyond the reach of sympathy: the cry of suffering is no longer audible. He has ceased to move among the people with friendly greeting, or considerate counsel. He no longer exhibits any interest in their affairs, or keeps his memory green in their hearts by assisting in local charity. After a time he becomes to them as impersonal as an abstract idea, as relentless as a tax-gatherer. Can we wonder, then, that the result is disastrous? It is notorious that it is upon properties managed through agents that almost all the serious agrarian outrages occur, and that resident landlords as a rule find no difficulty in dealing with their tenants.

As the most prominent among the measures of social reform we must notice one for the partial establishment of peasant proprietors; and there can be little doubt that the example of thrifty farmers, belonging to their own class, might act as an effective stimulus to the tenants throughout the country.

Two attempts have already been made in this direction, and not with any marked success. The first was under the Church Disestablishment Act of 1869, by which the Commissioners in whom the Church property was vested were directed, in selling the glebe lands, to give a preference to the occupying tenants, and to permit three-fourths of the purchase-money to remain on mortgage at 4 per cent., the instalments for payment extending over thirty-two years.

The landed property thus available consisted of 108,000 acres in the occupation of 8432 tenants, occupying on the average about 13 acres each, and paying a rent of less than one pound per acre. By the end of the year 1877, 5243 of these holdings had been transferred to the occupiers; but of these about 500 were merely cottages, while in 800 cases the intending purchasers were compelled by want of means to transfer their bargains to local capitalists, and to resume their position as tenants of the men to whom they had sold.

Under the Land Act of 1870 another effort was made in the same direction. The Board of Works was authorised to advance to purchasing tenants two-thirds of the purchase money, repayable by half-yearly instalments in thirty-five years, each instalment being five pounds for every hundred advanced, which is equivalent to a loan at  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. These provisions, however, have not proved as efficacious as was expected. Of the



million which the Treasury was empowered to provide, not one-half had, on the 31st March, 1879, been actually issued; and only 753 tenants had by this means been assisted in the purchase of their holdings. If we examine these sales more particularly we cannot fail to be struck by the fact, that the benefit does not reach the really poor class of farmers, but is practically confined to those who are very well off already. Of the entire number of 753 tenants who have purchased under these clauses, 380, or more than half, are occupiers of more than 30 acres. The total number of agricultural holdings in Ireland is 592,590, and of these 498,000 or about five-sixths are from one to fifty acres, while the number of tenant purchasers holding more than 50 acres exceeds one-third of the whole number. These figures prove that the minority of large farmers furnished a relatively large proportion of the buyers.

The failure of these clauses is attributed chiefly to the difficulty felt by the Landed Estates Court in dividing the properties into lots to suit the intending purchasers. If a higher price can be obtained by selling the property as a whole than in small lots, the duty of the court is to sell it in that way so as to obtain the best price for the vendor. Again, most properties are subject to rent-charges, or annuities, to the payment of which the whole estate is liable. Upon the sale of such a property very great difficulties arise in apportioning the charges among a number of small holdings. And the result has proved that unless all the tenants of an estate are able to take concerted action, they derive no benefit from the Act.

The Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into the operation of the Land Act in this respect reported in 1878 "that it is very desirable that further facilities should be given for the purchase by tenants of the fee-simple of under their holdings;" and that, in order to avoid the difficulty the present system of dividing properties in suitable lots:—

An independent body should be constituted, specially charged with the duty of superintending and facilitating the purchase of their several farms by the occupying tenants. Your committee are of opinion that the body thus constituted should put themselves into communication with the tenants of properties offered for sale in the Landed Estates Court, should explain to them the facilities offered by the Act, should represent their interests before the Court in lotting of properties or otherwise, and should only purchase and re-sell properties in lots as aforesaid, when satisfied that such a proportion of the tenants are prepared to buy as will prevent any loss to the funds at their disposal.

Now, there are a few observations which we wish to make upon this scheme. The first is, that as a measure to relieve distress

it cannot be expected to work efficaciously. Experience proves that it is the well-to-do farmer of fifty acres, not the slovenly occupier of five, who desires to buy, and is able to find even the small fraction of the purchase-money that has to be paid down. Secondly, in thus inaugurating a system of peasant proprietorship we deprive it of one of its principal chances of success—the independence of an owner. What has proved in all countries the bane of such a system is the facility with which the owner falls into debt, and burthens the land with the claims of the usurer. Here, we start him on his career with a load of debt already weighing him down. Thirdly, we fear that this Land Commission would not be self-supporting; that, in fact, it would be a heavy loser by having unsold lots left on its hands, by re-sales to the tenants, and by the non-payment of the instalments of purchase money. And, lastly, we must express a strong opinion against the suitability, even under the most favourable circumstances, of a system of peasant proprietorship to a country like Ireland, where the farming operations occupy only a small part of the year. The essential condition of successful peasant culture is that there should be such a variety of avocations that the time of the small owner should be fully devoted to the minute culture of his farm. With such crops as potatoes and oats, the preparation of the ground, the sowing of the seed, and the gathering of the harvest are necessarily crowded into short periods of time; and the owner has not the opportunity, even if he had the desire, of developing habits of persistent industry. We think that if a peasant is to succeed in managing his own small property, he should first show that he is capable of successfully farming the ground which he occupies; and that he should be required, as a condition of his purchase, to save the larger part of the money before he is constituted a peasant proprietor. In other words, thrift should precede ownership, instead of owner being made a term synonymous with debtor.

Another favourite scheme for the relief of Ireland consists in emigration, assisted by Government funds. That the current has set very strongly in this direction without artificial stimulus is proved by the fact that since the 1st May, 1851, upwards of two and a half millions of Irish-born persons have emigrated from Ireland. This vast exodus is a natural effort to relieve the country of its superabundant population; and, as might be expected, with a diminishing population the proportion of emigrants has also decreased. Thus, in the decennial period ending with the 1st May, 1861, the number was 1,227,710, while in the next ten years it amounted to but 819,903. The annual returns exhibit very considerable fluctuations, ranging

from 190,000 in 1852, to 37,587 in 1876. Since that year the number has risen gradually to 47,065 in the year 1879. There are two statistical facts of prime importance in estimating the effect of emigration on the condition of Ireland. (1). That from the relatively flourishing province of Ulster, a larger proportion of emigrants is furnished than from Connaught, where the population is admittedly overcrowded. (2). That seventy per cent. of these exiles are between the ages of fifteen and thirty-five; and it is thus the flower of Ireland's manhood that is exported from her shores. It appears to follow from these facts that, so far as any benefit to the country is concerned, emigration removes the wrong people, and from the wrong places. Famine and pestilence gather their victims from the old and feeble, or at least strike with impartial fury; but emigration takes from the population those who are the hope and strength of the country, and leaves the old man and the infant to encumber her workhouses.

As for the emigrants themselves, it is very doubtful how much they gain by leaving the land of their birth. It is true there are now large and flourishing provinces of the Catholic Church in America and Australia which owe their existence to the Irish immigration. It is true also that large sums of money come back every year to the assistance of those left behind. But thousands have lost their faith; thousands have been swamped and swallowed up in the turbid licence of American cities; and even, with those who are Catholics still, it may be feared that the counsel and the reproof of the priest have lost much of their power, and that democratic manners, which never yet benefited a Celtic people, have deprived them of reverence without accustoming them to self-restraint.

We have already referred to the Church surplus as a fortune which has unexpectedly devolved upon the country. This does not express the entire truth, for the fund is not a gift but an act of restitution; and we expect that in its application some regard should be paid to the purposes for which it was originally intended. The tithe, like every other revenue of the Catholic Church, was a trust fund for the support of the clergy, the building and repair of churches, and the relief of the poor; and we can imagine no investment which, without hurting the susceptibilities of any class in the community, would approach more closely to a general compliance with these trusts than the building of convenient glebe houses for the Catholic priests. They are sadly needed, and money could scarcely be expended to better advantage or for a more truly national purpose than in thus giving decent dwellings to the teachers of the people. It is, moreover, an act of the strictest justice, since the clergy of

the Disestablished Church were suffered to retain their glebe houses and churches at a ridiculously inadequate figure. Nor are we asking persons who object to concurrent endowment to give a penny from imperial resources. Here is a fund purely religious in its character, purely Irish in its origin, available for the purpose of supplying a very serious want. It is not only just but expedient also. The Catholic priests have ever been on the side of law and order. It is not too much to say that the English Government is more indebted to them for the maintenance of peace than to flying columns and armies of police. And it is only natural to suppose that their beneficial influence would be strengthened, their love of peace intensified by the possession of a home. This scheme has been recently supported by a writer in the *Edinburgh Review*,\* to whose able Article we have much pleasure in admitting our obligations. There are many topics to which, if our space were unlimited, we would gladly refer as bearing more or less directly upon the prosperity of the country. University education, the establishment of manufactories, cottage industries, the encouragement of planting, the reclamation of waste lands, the improvement of the dwellings of the people, and many other subjects crowd before our minds in connection with the possible future of Ireland. But we are satisfied to have presented to our readers her present wretchedness, and a brief outline of one or two of the principal measures which have been proposed for its relief. We can expect from them little more than the alleviation of her poverty. It would be absurd to suppose that by the most beneficent laws Ireland could be changed into a land as rich as England. Do we desire it? Had we the power, by an effort of will, to replace her green fields by crowded mills and factories, her simple peasants by pale and sickly operatives, we should hesitate to exercise it. It is an affecting spectacle to behold a country periodically stretching forth her hands for food; and her benefactors no doubt feel a gratifying sense of superior respectability as they administer it. Yet we tell them that poor and in rags, with the tears on her cheeks, she is more glorious than they. Where is the nation in Europe that has not at some time wavered in its allegiance to the Catholic faith? She alone,

Still constant in a wondrous excellence,

has preserved with fervour and simplicity, through the shock of changing creeds, through persecutions, confiscations and famines, the same unalterable faith that she received from her great

\* See "Ireland, her Present and her Future."—*Edinburgh Review*, January, 1880.

apostle. This is the distinctive feature of her nationality ; this is the hope of her future, as it is the glory of her past. She is unlike all other countries in this respect, that hitherto religion has been the first object of her national life. We trust that the day is far distant when vain aspirations for an unattainable ideal will succeed in drawing her into the perilous path of international strife. Let other peoples toil and struggle for wealth, or desecrate the world with warfare, or become famous in learning and arts of so-called civilization ; Ireland will have accomplished her glorious mission if she retain her religious greatness, and her claim to be still called "the Island of Saints."

---

## ENCYCLICAL OF POPE LEO XIII.

ON

## CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

*Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis Primatibus Archiepiscopis et  
Episcopis Universis Catholici Orbis, gratiam et communionem  
cum Apostolica Sede habentibus.*

LEO PP. XIII.

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

ARCANUM divinae sapientiae consilium, quod Salvator hominum Iesus Christus in terris erat perfecturus, eo spectavit, ut mundum, quasi vetustate senescentem, Ipse per se et in se divinitus instauraret. Quod splendida et grandi sententia complexus est Paullus Apostolus, cum ad Ephesios ita scriberet : *Sacramentum voluntatis suae . . . instaurare omnia in Christo, quae in coelis et quae in terra sunt.*\*—Revera cum Christus Dominus mandatum facere instituit quod dederat illi Pater, continuo novam quamdam formam ac speciem rebus omnibus impertiit, vetustate depulsa. Quae enim vulnera piaculum primi parentis humanae naturae imposuerat, Ipse sanavit : homines universos, natura filios irae, in gratiam cum Deo restituit ; diuturnis fatigatos erroribus ad veritatis lumen traduxit ; omni impuritate confectos ad omnem virtutem innovavit ; redonatisque hereditati beatitudinis sempiternae spem certam fecit, ipsum eorum corpus, mortale et caducum, immortalitatis et gloriae caelestis particeps aliquando futurum. Quo vero tam singularia beneficia, quamdiu essent homines, tamdiu in terris permanerent, Ecclesiam constituit vicariam muneris sui, eamque iussit, in futurum prospiciens, si quid esset in hominum societate perturbatum, ordinare ; si quid collapsum, restituere.

Quamquam vero divina haec instauratio, quam diximus, praecipue et directo homines attigit in ordine gratiae supernaturali constitutos, tamen pretiosius ac salutare eiusdem fructus in ordinem quoque naturalem largiter permanarunt ; quomobrem non mediocrem perfectionem in omnes partes acceperunt cum singuli homines, tum humani generis societas universa. Etenim, christiano rerum ordine semel condito, hominibus singulis feliciter contigit, ut ediscerent atque adsucescerent in paterna Dei providentia conquirere, et spem alere, quae non confundit, caelestium auxiliorum ; quibus ex rebus fortitudo, moderatio, constantia, aequabilitas pacati animi, plures denique praeclarae virtutes et egregia facta consequuntur.—Societati vero domesticae et civili mirum est quantum dignitatis, quantum firmitudinis et honestatis accesserit. Aequior et sanctior effecta principum auctoritas ; propensior et facilius populorum obtemperatio ; arctior civium coniunctio ; tutiora iura dominii. Omnino rebus omnibus, quae in civitate

\* Ad Eph. I. 9-10.



habentur utiles, religio christiana consuluit et providit; ita quidem, ut, auctore S. Augustino, plus ipsa afferre momenti ad bene beateque vivendum non potuisse videatur, si esset parandis vel augendis mortalis vitae commodis et utilitatibus unice nata.

Verum de hoc genere toto non est Nobis propositum modo singula enumerare; volumus autem de convictu domestico eloqui, cuius est in *matrimonio* principium et fundamentum.

Constat inter omnes, Venerabiles Fratres, quae vera sit matrimonii origo.—Quamvis enim fidei christianae vituperatores perpetuam hac de re doctrinam Ecclesiae fugiant agnoscere, et memoriam omnium gentium, omnium saeculorum delere iamdiu contendant, vim tamen lucemque veritatis nec extinguere nec debilitare potuerunt. Nota omnibus et nemini dubia commemoramus: posteaquam sexto creationis die formavit Deus hominem de limo terrae, et inspiravit in faciem eius spiraculum vitae, sociam illi voluit adiungere, quam de latere viri ipsius dormientis mirabiliter eduxit. Qua in re hoc voluit providentissimus Deus, ut illud par coniugum esset cunctorum hominum naturale principium, ex quo scilicet propagari humanum genus, et, numquam intermissis procreationibus, conservari in omne tempus oporteret. Atque illa viri et mulieris coniunctio, quo sapientissimis Dei consiliis responderet aptius, vel ex eo tempore duas potissimum, easque in primis nobiles, quasi alte impressas et insculptas prae se tulit proprietates, nimirum unitatem et perpetuitatem.—Idque declaratum aperteque confirmatum ex Evangelio perspicimus divina Iesu Christi auctoritate; qui Iudaeis et Apostolis testatus est, matrimonium ex ipsa institutione sui dumtaxat inter duos esse debere, scilicet virum inter et mulierem; ex duobus unam veluti carnem fieri; et nuptiale vinculum sic esse Dei voluntate intime vehementerque nexum, ut a quopiam inter homines dissolvi, aut distrahi nequeat. *Adhaerebit (homo) uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una. Itaque iam non sunt duo, sed una caro. Quod ergo Deus coniunxit, homo non separet.\**

Verum haec coniugii forma, tam excellens atque praestans, sensim corrumpi et interire apud ethnicos populos coepit; et penes ipsum Hebraeorum genus quasi obnubilari atque obscurari visa.—Nam apud hos de uxoribus susceperat consuetudo communis, ut singulis viris habere plus una liceret; post autem, cum *ad duritiam cordis*† eorum indulgenter permisisset Moyses repudiorum potestatem, ad divortium factus est aditus.—In societate vero ethnicorum vix credibile videatur, quantam corruptelam et demutationem nuptiae contraxerint, quippe quae obiectae fluctibus essent errorum uniuscuiusque populi et cupiditatum turpissimarum. Cunctae plus minus gentes dediscere notionem germanamque originem matrimonii visae sunt; eamque ob causam de coniugiis passim ferebantur leges, quae esse e republica viderentur, non quas natura postulare. Sollemnes ritus, arbitrio legumlatorum inventi, efficiebant ut honestum uxoris, aut turpe concubinae nomen mulieres nanciscerentur; quin eo ventum erat, ut auctoritate principum reipublicae caveretur, quibus esset permisum inire nuptias, et quibus non esset, multum legibus contra aequitatem contententibus, multum pro

\* Matth. xix. 5, 6.

† Matth. xix. 8.

iniuria. Praeterea polygamia, polyandria, divortium caussae fuerunt, quomobrem nuptiale vinculum magnopere relaxaretur. Summa quoque in mutuis coniugum iuribus et officiis perturbatio exitit, cum vir dominium uxoris acquireret, eamque suas sibi res habere, nulla saepe iusta causa, iuberet; sibi vero ad effrenatam et indomitam libidinem praecipiti impune liceret *excurre per lupanaria et ancillas, quasi culpam dignitas faciat, non voluntas.\** Exsuperante viri licentia, nihil erat uxore miserius, in tantam humilitatem deiecta, ut instrumentum pene haberetur ad explendam libidinem, vel gignendam sobolem comparatum. Nec pudor fuit, collocandas in matrimonium emi vendi, in rerum corporearum similitudinem,† data interdum parenti maritoque facultate extremum supplicium de uxore sumendi. Talibus familiam ortam connubiis necesse erat aut in bonis reipublicae esse, aut in mancipio patrifamilias,‡ cui leges hoc quoque posse dederant, non modo liberorum conficere et dirimere arbitrato suo nuptias, verum etiam in eosdem exercere vitae necisque immanem potestatem.

Sed tot vitiis, tantisque ignominiis, quibus erant inquinata coniugia, sublevatio tandem et medicina divinitus quaesita est; quandoquidem restitutor dignitatis humanae legumque mosaicarum perfector Iesus Christus non exiguum, neque postremam de matrimonio curam adhibuit. Etenim nuptias in Cana Galilaeae Ipse praesentia sua nobilitavit, primoque ex prodigiis a se editis fecit memorabiles; § quibus caussis vel ex eo die in hominum coniugia novae cuiusdam sanctitudinis initia videntur esse profecta. Deinde matrimonium revocavit ad primaevae originis nobilitatem, cum Hebraeorum mores improbando, quod et multitudine uxorum et repudiū facultate abuterentur; tum maxime praecipiendo, ne quis dissolvere auderet quod perpetuo coniunctionis vinculo Deus ipse constrinxisset. Quapropter cum difficultates diluisset ab institutis mosaicis in medium allatas, supremi legislatoris suscepta persona, haec de coniugibus sanxit: *Dico autem vobis, quia quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, nisi ob fornicationem, et aliam duxerit, moechatur; et qui dimissam duxerit, moechatur.¶*

Veram quae auctoritate Dei de coniugiis decreta et constituta sunt, ea nuncii divinarum legum Apostoli plenius et enucleatius memoriae litterisque prodiderunt. Iamvero Apostolis magistris accepta referenda sunt, quae *sancti Patres nostri, Concilia et universalis Ecclesiae traditio semper docuerunt,¶* nimirum Christum Dominum ad Sacramenti dignitatem evexisse matrimonium; simulque effecisse ut coniuges, coelesti gratia quam merita eius pepererunt septi ac muniti, sanctitatem in ipso coniugio adipiscerentur: atque in eo, ad exemplar mystici connubii sui cum Ecclesia mire conformato, et amorem qui est naturae consentaneus perfecisse,\*\* et viri ac mulieris individuum suapte natura societatem divinae caritatis vinculo validius coniunxisse. *Viri* Paullus inquit ad Ephesios, *diligite uxores vestras, sicut et Christus dilexit Ecclesiam et seipsum tradidit pro ea, ut illam sanctificaret . . . Viri debent diligere uxores suas ut corpora sua . . . nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit; sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut et Christus*

\* Hieronym. Oper. tom. i. col. 455.

† Arnob. adv. Gent. 4.

‡ Dionys. Halicar. lib. ii. c. 26, 27.

§ Ioan. ii.

¶ Matth. xix. 9.

¶ Trid. sess. xxiv. in pr.

\*\* Trid. sess. xxiv. cap. 1 de reform. matr.

*Ecclesiam; quia membra sumus corporis eius, de carne eius et de ossibus eius. Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem suam et adhaerebit uxori suae et erunt duo in carne una. Sacramentum hoc magnum est: ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia.\*—Similiter Apostolis auctoribus didicimus unitatem, perpetuamque firmitatem, quae ab ipsa requirebatur nuptiarum origine, sanctam esse et nullo tempore violabilem Christum iussisse. Iis qui matrimonio iuncti sunt, idem Paullus ait, praecipio non ego, sed Dominus, uxorem a viro non discedere; quod si discesserit, manere innuptam, aut viro suo reconciliari.† Et rursus: Mulier alligata est legi, quanto tempore vir eius vivit: quod si dormierit vir eius liberata est.‡—Hisce igitur causis matrimonium extitit sacramentum magnum,§ honorabile in omnibus,|| pium, castum, rerum altissimarum imagine et significatione verendum.*

Neque iis dumtaxat quae commemorata sunt, christiana eius perfectio absolutioque continetur. Nam primo quidem nuptiali societati excelsius quiddam et nobilius propositum est, quam antea fuisset; ea enim spectare iussa est non modo ad propagandum genus humanum, sed ad ingenerandam Ecclesiae sobolem, *cives Sanctorum et domesticos Dei;¶* ut nimirum *populus ad veri Dei et Salvatoris nostri Christi cultum et religionem procrearetur atque educaretur.\*\*—*Secundo loco sua utrique coniugum sunt officia definita, sua iura integre descripta. Eos scilicet ipsos necesse est sic esse animo semper affectos, ut amorem maximum, constantem fidem, sollers assiduamque praesidium alteri alterum debere intelligant.—Vir est familiae princeps, et caput mulieris; quae tamen, quia caro est de carne illius et os de ossibus eius, subiciatur pareatque viro, in morem non ancillae, sed sociae; ut scilicet obedientiae praestitae nec honestas, nec dignitas absit. In eo autem qui praeest, et in hac quae paret, cum imaginem uterque referant alter Christi, altera Ecclesiae, divina caritas esto perpetua moderatrix officii. Nam *vir caput est mulieris, sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae . . . . Sed sicut Ecclesia subiecta est Christo, ita et mulieres viris suis in omnibus.††—*Ad liberos quod pertinet, subesse et obtemperare parentibus, hisque honorem adhibere propter conscientiam debent; et vicissim in liberis tuendis atque ad virtutem potissimum informandis omnes parentum curas cogitationesque evigilare necesse est: *Patres . . . . educate illos (filios) in disciplina et correptione Domini.‡‡* Ex quo intelligitur, nec pauca esse coniugum officia, neque levia; ea tamen coniugibus bonis ob virtutem quae Sacramento percipitur, non modo tolerabilia fiunt, verum etiam iucunda.

Christus igitur, cum ad talem ac tantam excellentiam matrimonia renovavisset, totam ipsorum disciplinam Ecclesiae credidit et commendavit. Quae potestatem in coniugia christianorum omni cum tempore, tum loco exercuit, atque ita exercuit, ut illam propriam eius esse appareret, nec hominum concessu quaesitam, sed auctoris sui voluntate divinitus adeptam.—Quot vero et quam vigiles curas in retinenda sanctitate nuptiarum collocarit, ut sua his incolumitas

\* Ad. Ephes. v. 25 et seqq.

† 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

‡ Ibid. v. 39.

§ Ad. Eph. v. 32.

|| Ad Hebr. xiii. 4.

¶ Ad Eph. ii. 19.

\*\* Catech. Rom. cap. viii.

†† Ad Eph. v. 23, 24.

‡‡ Ad Eph. vi. 4.

maneret, plus est cognitum quam ut demonstrari debeat.—Et sane improbatos novimus Concilii Hierosolymitani sententia amores solutos et liberos;\* civem Corinthium incesti damnatum beati Pauli auctoritate;† propulsatos ac reiectos eodem semper tenore fortitudinis conatus plurimorum, matrimonium christianum hostiliter petentium, videlicet Gnosticorum, Manichaeorum, Montanistarum sub ipsa rei christinae primordia; nostra autem memoria Mormonum, Sansimonianorum, Phalansterianorum, Communistarum.—Simili modo ius matrimonii aequabile inter omnes atque unum omnibus est constitutum, vetere inter servos et ingenuos sublato discrimine;‡ exaequata viri et uxoris iura; etenim, ut aiebat Hieronymus,§ *apud nos quod non licet feminis, aequè non licet viris, et eadem servitus pari conditione censetur*: atque illa eadem iura ob remunerationem benevolentiae et vicissitudinem officiorum stabiliter firmata; adserta et vindicta mulierum dignitas; vetitum viro poenam capitis de adultera sumere,|| iurataque fidem libidinosae atque impudice violare.—Atque illud etiam magnum est quod de potestate patrumfamilias Ecclesia, quantum oportuit, limitaverit ne filiis et filiabus coniugii cupidis quidquam de iusta libertate minueretur;¶ quod nuptias inter cognatos et affines certis gradibus nullas esse posse decreverit,\*\* ut nimirum supernaturalis coniugum amor latiore se campo diffunderet; quod errorem et vim et fraudem, quantum potuit, a nuptiis prohibenda curaverit;†† quod sanctam pudicitiam thalami, quod securitatem personarum,‡‡ quod coniugiorum decus,§§ quod religionis incolumitatem||| sacra tecta esse voluerit. Denique tanta vi, tanta providentia legum divinum istud institutum communiit, ut nemo sit rerum aequus existimator, quin intelligat, hoc etiam ex capite quod ad coniugia refertur, optimam esse humani generis custodem ac vindicem Ecclesiam; cuius sapientia et fugam temporum, et iniurias hominum, et rerum publicarum vicissitudines innumerabiles victrix evasit.

Sed, adnitente humani generis hoste, non desunt qui, sicut cetera redemptionis beneficia ingrate repudiant, sic restitutionem perfectionemque matrimonii aut spernunt, aut omnino non agnoscunt.—Flagitium nonnullorum veterum est, inimicos fuisse nuptiis in aliqua ipsarum parte; sed multo aetate nostra peccant prenciosius qui earum naturam, perfectam expletamque omnibus suis numeris et partibus malunt funditus pervertere. Atque huius rei caussa in ea praecipue sita est, quod imbuti falsae philosophiae opinionibus corruptaque consuetudine animi plurimorum, nihil tam moleste ferunt, quam subesse et parere; acerrimeque laborant, ut non modo singuli homines, sed etiam familiae atque omnis humana societas imperium Dei superbe contemnant.—Cum vero et familiae et totius humanae societatis in

\* Act xv. 29. † 1 Cor. v. 5. ‡ Cap. 1 de coniug. serv.

§ Oper. tom. i. col. 455. || Can. Interfectores, et Can. Admonere, quaesi 2.

¶ Cap. 30, quaesi. 3, cap. 3 de cognat. spirit.

\*\* Cap. 8 de consang. et affm.; cap. 1 de cognat. legali.

†† Cap. 26 de sponsal.; capp. 13, 15, 29 de sponsal. et matrim., et alib.

‡‡ Cap. 1 de convers. infid.; capp. 5 et 6 de eo qui duxit in matr.

§§ Capp. 3, 5 et 8 de sponsal. et matr.—Trid sess. xxiv, cap. 3 de reform. matr.

||| Cap. 7 de divort.

matrimonio fons et origio consistat, illud ipsum iurisdictioni Ecclesiae subesse nullo modo patiuntur; imo deiicere ab omni sanctitate contendunt, et in illarum rerum exiguum sane gyrum compellere, quae auctoribus hominibus institutae sunt, et iure civili populorum reguntur atque administrantur. Unde sequi necesse erat, ut principibus reipublicae ius in connubia omne tribuerent, nullum Ecclesiae esse decernerent; quae si quando potestatem eius generis exercuit, id ipsum esse aut indulgentia principum, aut iniuria factum. Sed iam tempus esse inquirunt, ut qui rempublicam gerunt, iidem sua iura fortiter vindicent, ætque omnem coniugiorum rationem arbitrio suo moderari aggrediantur.—Hinc illa nata, quae *matrimonia civilia* vulgo appellantur; hinc scitae leges de caussis, quae coniugiis impedimento sint; hinc iudiciales sententiae de contractibus coniugalibus, iure ne initi fuerint, an vitio. Postremo omnem facultatem in hoc genere iuris constituendi et dicundi videmus Ecclesiae catholicae praereptam tanto studio, ut nulla iam ratio habeatur nec divinae potestatis eius, nec providarum legum, quibus tamdiu vixere gentes, ad quas urbanitatis lumen cum christiana sapientia pervenisset.

Attamen *Naturalistae* iique omnes, qui reipublicae numen se maxime colere profitentes, malis hasce doctrinis totas civitates miscere nituntur, non possunt reprehensionem falsitatis effugere. Etenim cum matrimonium habeat Deum auctorem, fueritque vel a principio quaedam Incarnationis Verbi Dei adumbratio, idcirco inest in eo sacrum et religiosum quiddam, non adventitium, sed ingenitum, non ab hominibus acceptum, sed natura insitum. Quocirca Innocentius III.,\* et Honorius III.,† decessores Nostri, non iniuria nec temere affirmare potuerunt, *apud fideles et infideles existere Sacramentum coniugii*. Testamur et monumenta antiquitatis, et mores atque instituta populorum, qui ad humanitatem magis accesserant et exquisitioris iuris et aequitatis cognitione praestiterant: quorum omnium mentibus informatum anticipatumque fuisse constat, ut cum de matrimonio cogitarent, forma occurreret rei cum religione et sanctitate coniunctae. Hanc ob causam nuptiae apud illos non sine caerimoniis religionum, auctoritate pontificum, ministerio sacerdotum fieri saepe consueverunt.—Ita magnam in animis coelesti doctrina carentibus vim habuit natura rerum, memoria originum, conscientia generis humani!—Igitur cum matrimonium sit sua vi, sua natura, sua sponte sacrum, consentaneum est, ut regatur ac temperetur non principum imperio, sed divina auctoritate Ecclesiae, quae rerum sacrarum sola habet magisterium.—Deinde considerata sacramenti dignitas est, cuius accessione matrimonia christianorum evasere longe nobilissima. De sacramente autem statuere et praecipere, ita, ex voluntate Christi, sola potest et debet Ecclesia, ut absonum sit plane potestatis eius vel minimam partem ad gubernatores rei civilis velle esse translata.—Postremo magnum pondus est, magna vis historiae, qua luculenter docemur, potestatem legiferam et iudicalem, de qua loquimur, libere constanterque ab Ecclesia usurpari consuevisse iis etiam temporibus, quando principes reipublicae consentientes fuisse aut conniventes in ea re,

\* Cap. 8 de divort.

† Cap. 11 de ransact.

inepte et stulte fingeretur. Illud enim quam incredibile, quam absurdum, Christum Dominum dannasse polygamiae repudiique inveteratam consuetudinem! delegata sibi a procuratore provinciae vel a principe Iudaeorum potestate; similiter Paullum Apostolum divortia incestasque nuptias edixisse non licere, cedentibus aut tacite mandantibus Tiberio, Caligola, Nerone! Neque illud unquam homini sanae mentis potest persuaderi, de sanctitate et firmitudine coniugii,\* de nuptiis servos inter et ingenuas,† tot esse ab Ecclesia conditas leges, impetrata facultate ab Imperatoribus romanis, inimicissimis nomini christiano, quibus nihil tam fuit propositum, quam vi et caede religionem Christi opprimere adolescentem: praesertim cum ius illud ab Ecclesia profectum a civili iure interdum adeo dissideret, ut Ignatius Martyr,‡ Iustinus,§ Athenagoras|| et Tertullianus,¶ tamquam iniustas vel adulterinas publice traducerent nonnullorum nuptias, quibus tamen imperatoriae leges favebant.—Postea vero quam ad christianos Imperatores potentatus omnis reciderat, Pontifices maximi et Episcopi in Concilia congregati, eadem semper cum libertate conscientiaeque iuris sui, de matrimoniis iubere vetare perseverarunt quod utile esse, quod expedire temporibus censuissent, utcumque discrepans ab institutis civilibus videretur. Nemo ignorat quam multa de impedimentis ligaminis, voti, disparitatis cultus, consanguinitatis, criminis, publicae honestatis in Conciliis Illiberitano,\*\* Arelatensi,†† Chalcedonensi,‡‡ Milevitano II.§§ aliisque, fuerint ab Ecclesiae praesulibus constituta, quae a decretis iure imperatorio sancitis longe saepe distarent.—Quin tantum abfuit, ut viri principes sibi adscicerent in matrimonia christiana potestatem, ut potius eam, quanta est, penes Ecclesiam esse agnoscerent et declararent. Revera Honorius, Theodosius iunior, Iustinianus||| fateri non dubitarunt, in iis rebus quae nuptias attingant, non amplius quam custodibus et defensoribus sacrorum canonum sibi esse licere. Et de connubiorum impedimentis si quid per edicta sanxerunt, causam docuerunt non inviti, nimirum id sibi sumpsisse ex Ecclesiae permisso atque auctoritate;¶¶ cuius ipsius iudicium exquirere et reverenter accipere consueverunt in controversiis de honestate natalium,\*\*\* de divortii,††† denique de rebus omnibus cum coniugali vinculo necessitudinem quoquo modo habentibus.†††—Igitur iure optimo in Concilio Tridentino definitum est in Ecclesiae potestate esse *impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia constituere,§§§ et causas matrimoniales ad iudices ecclesiasticos spectare.||||*

Nec quemquam moveat illa tantopere a Regalistis praedicata distinctio, vi cuius contractum nuptialem a sacramento disiungunt, eo sane consilio, ut, Ecclesiae reservatis sacramenti rationibus, contractum tradant in potestatem arbitriumque principum civitatis.—Etenim non

\* Can. Apost. 16-18.

† Philosophum. Oxon. 1851.

‡ Epist. ad Polycarp. cap. 5.

§ Apolog. mai. n. 15.

|| Legat. pro Christian. n. 32, 33.

¶ De coron. milit. cap. 13.

\*\* De Aguirre, Conc. Hispan. tom. i. can. 13, 15-17.

†† Harduin., Act. Concil. t. m. I. can. 11. ‡‡ Ibid. can. 16. §§ Ibid. can. 17.

||| Novel. 137.

¶¶ Fejer Matrim. ex instit. Christ. Pesth. 1835.

\*\*\* Cap. 3 de ordin. cognit.

††† Cap. 3 de divort.

††† Cap. 18 qui filii sint legit.

§§§ Trid. sess. xxiv. can. 4.

|||| Ibid. can. 12.



potest huiusmodi distinctio, seu verius distractio, probari; cum exploratum sit in matrimonio christiano contractum a sacramento non esse dissociabilem; atque ideo non posse contractum verum et legitimum consistere, quin sit eo ipso sacramentum. Nam Christus Dominus dignitate sacramenti auxit matrimonium; matrimonium autem est ipse contractus, si modo sit factus iure.—Huc accedit, quod ob hanc causam matrimonium est sacramentum, quia est sacrum signum et efficiens gratiam, et imaginem referens mysticarum nuptiarum Christi cum Ecclesia. Istarum autem forma ac figura illo ipso exprimitur summae coniunctionis vinculo, quo vir et mulier inter se conligantur, quodque aliud nihil est, nisi ipsum matrimonium. Itaque apparet, omne inter christianos iustum coniugium in se et per se esse sacramentum: nihilque magis abhorrere a veritate, quam esse sacramentum decus quoddam adiunctum, aut proprietatem allapsam extrinsecus, quae a contractu disiungi ac disparari hominum arbitratu queat.—Quapropter nec ratione efficitur, nec teste temporum historia comprobatur potestatem in matrimonia christianorum ad principes reipublicae esse iure traductam. Quod si hac in re alienum violatum ius est, nemo profecto dixerit esse ab Ecclesia violatum.

Utinam vero Naturalistarum oracula, ut sunt plena falsitatis et iniustitiae, ita non etiam essent fecunda detrimetorum et calamitatum. Sed facile est pervidere quantam profanata coniugia perniciem attulerint; quantam allatura sint universae hominum communitati.—Principio quidem lex est provisa divinitus, ut quae Deo et natura auctoribus instituta sunt, ea tanto plus utilia ac salutaria experiamur, quanto magis statu nativo manent integra atque incommutabilia: quandoquidem procreator rerum omnium Deus probe novit quid singularum institutioni et conservationi expediret, cunctasque voluntate et mente sua sic ordinavit, ut suum unaquaeque exitum convenienter habitura sit. At si rerum ordinem providentissime constitutum immutare et perturbare hominum temeritas aut improbitas velit, tum vero etiam sapientissime atque utilissime instituta aut obesse incipiunt, aut prodesse desinunt, vel quod vim iuvandi mutatione amiserint, vel quod tales Deus ipse poenas malit de mortalium superbia atque audacia sumere. Iamvero qui sacrum esse matrimonium negant, atque omni despoliatum sanctitate in rerum profanarum coniiciunt genus, ii pervertunt fundamenta naturae, et divinae providentiae tum consiliis repugnant, tum instituta, quantum potest, demoluntur. Quapropter mirum esse non debet, ex huiusmodi conatibus insanis atque impiis eam generari malorum segetem, qua nihil est saluti animorum incolunitatque reipublicae perniciosius.

Si consideretur quorsum matrimoniorum pertineat divina institutio, id erit evidentissimum, includere in illis voluisse Deum utilitatis et salutis publicae uberrimos fontes. Et sane, praeter quam quod propagationi generis humani prospiciunt, illuc quoque pertinent, ut meliorem vitam coniugum beatioremque efficiant; idque pluribus causis, nempe mutuo ad necessitates sublevandas adiumento, amore constanti et fideli, communionem omnium bonorum, gratia caelesti, quae a sacramento proficiscitur. Eadem vero plurimum possunt ad familiarum salutem; nam matrimonia quamdiu sint congruentia naturae

Deique consiliis apte convenient, firmare profecto valebunt animorum concordiam inter parentes, tueri bonam institutionem liberorum, temperare patriam potestatem proposito divinae potestatis exemplo, filios parentibus, famulos heris facere obedientes. Ab eiusmodi autem coniugiis expectare civitates iure possunt genus et sobolem civium qui probe animati sint, Deique reverentia atque amore assueti, sui officii esse ducant iuste et legitime imperantibus obtemperare, cunctos diligere, laedere neminem.

Hos fructus tantos ac tam praeclaros tamdiu matrimonium revera genuit, quamdiu munera sanctitatis, unitatis, perpetuitatisque retinuit a quibus vim omnem accipit frugiferam et salutarem; neque est dubitandum similes paresque ingeneratum fuisse, si semper et ubique in potestatem fidemque fuisset Ecclesiae, quae illorum munus est fidissima conservatrix et vindex. — Sed quia modo passim libuit humanum ius in locum naturalis et divini supponere, deleri non solum coepit matrimonii species ac notio praestantissima, quam in animis hominum impresserat et quasi consignaverat natura; sed in ipsis etiam Christianorum coniugiis, hominum vitio, multum vis illa debilitata est magnorum bonorum procreatrix. Quid est enim boni quod nuptiales afferre possint societates, unde abscedere christiana religio iubetur, quae parens est omnium bonorum, maximasque alit virtutes, excitans et impellens ad decus omne generosi animi atque excelsi? Illa igitur semota ac reiecta, redigi nuptias oportet in servitutem vitiosae hominum naturae et pessimaram dominarum cupiditatum, honestatis naturalis parum valido defensae patrocinio. Hoc fonte multiplex derivata perniciēs, non modo in privatas familias, sed etiam in civitates influxit. Etenim salutari depulso Dei metu, sublataque curarum levatione, quae nusquam alibi est quam in religione christiana maior, persaepe fit, quod est factu proclive, ut vix ferenda matrimonii munera et officia videantur; et liberari nimis multi vinculum velint, quod iure humano et sponte nexum putant, si dissimilitudo ingeniorum, aut discordia, aut fides ab alterutro violata, aut utriusque consensus, aliaeve causae liberari suadeant oportere. Et si forte fieri procacitati voluntatum lege prohibeatur, tum iniquas clamant esse leges, inhumanas, cum iure civium liberorum pugnantes; quapropter omnino videndum ut, illis antiquatis abrogatisque, licere divortia humaniore lege decernatur.

Nostrorum autem temporum legumlatores, cum eorundem iuris principiorum tenaces se ac studiosos profiteantur, ab illa hominum improbitate, quam diximus, se tueri non possunt, etiamsi maxime velint: quare cedendum temporibus ac divortiorum concedenda facultas. — Quod historia idem ipsa declaret. Ut enim alia praetereamus, exeunte saeculo superiore, in illa non tam perturbatione quam deflagratione Galliarum, cum societas omnis, amoto Deo, profanaretur, tum demum placuit ratis legibus esse coniugum discessionēs. Easdem autem leges renovari hoc tempore multi cupiunt, propterea quod Deum et Ecclesiam pelli e medio ac submoveri volunt a societate coniunctionis humanae; stulte putantes extremum grassanti morum corruptelae remedium ob eiusmodi legibus esse quaerendum.

At vero quanti materiam mali in se divortia contineant, vix attinet

dicere. Eorum enim caussa fiunt maritalia foedera mutabilia; extenuatur mutua benevolentia; infidelitati pernicioso incitamenta supeditantur; tuitioni atque institutioni liberorum nocetur; dissuendis societatibus domesticis praebetur occasio; discordiarum inter familias semina sparguntur; minuitur ac deprimitur dignitas mulierum, quae in periculum veniunt ne, cum libidini virorum inservierint, pro derelictis habeantur.—Et quoniam ad perdendas familias, frangendasque regnorum opes nihil tam valet, quam corruptela morum, facile perspicitur, prosperitati familiarum ac civitatum maxime inimica esse divortia, quae a depravatis populorum moribus nascuntur, ac, teste rerum usu, ad vitiosiores vitae privatae et publicae consuetudines aditum ianuamque patefaciunt.—Multoque esse graviora haec mala constabit si consideretur, frenos, nullos futuros tantos qui concessam semel divortiorum valeant intra certos, aut ante provisos, limites coercere. Magna prorsus est vis exemplorum, maior cupiditatum: hisce incitamenti fieri debet, ut divortiorum libido latius quotidie serpens plurimorum animos invadat, quasi morbus contagione vulgatus, aut agmen aquarum, superatis aggeribus, exundans.

Haec certe sunt omnia per se clara; sed renovanda rerum gestarum memoria fiunt clariora.—Simul ac iter divortiis tutum lege praestari coepit, dissidia, similitates, secessiones plurimum crevere; et tanta est vivendi turpitudine consecuta, ut eos ipsos, qui fuerant talium discessionum defensores, facti poenituerit; qui nisi contraria lege remedium mature quaesissent, timendum erat, ne praeceps in suam ipsa perniciem respublica dilaberetur.—Romani veteres prima divortiorum exempla dicuntur inhorruisse; sed non longa mora sensus honestatis in animis obstupescere, moderator cupiditatis pudor interire, fidesque nuptialis tanta cum licentia violari coepit, ut magnam veri similitudinem habere videatur quod a nonnullis scriptum legimus, mulieres non mutatione consulum, sed maritorum enumerare annos consuevisse.—Pari modo apud Protestantes principio quidem leges sanxerant, ut divortia fieri liceret certis de causis, iisque non sane multis: istas tamen propter rerum similium affinitatem, compertum est in tantam multitudinem excrevisse apud Germanos, Americanos, aliosque, ut qui non stulte sapuissent, magnopere defendendam putarint infinitam morum depravationem, atque intolerandam legum temeritatem.—Neque aliter se res habuit in civitatibus catholici nominis: in quibus si quando datus est coniugiorum dissidiis locus, incommodorum, quae consecuta sunt, multitudo opinionem legislatorum longe vicit. Nam scelus plurimorum fuit, ad omnem malitiam fraudemque versare mentem, ac per saevitiam adhibitam, per iniurias, per adulteria fingere caussas ad illud impune dissolvendum, cuius pertaesum esset, coniunctionis maritalis vinculum: idque cum tanto publicae honestatis detrimento, ut operam emendandis legibus quamprimum dari omnes iudicaverint oportere.—Et quisquam dubitabit, quin exitus aequae miseris et calamitosos habiturae sint leges divortiorum fautrices, sicubi forte in usum aetate nostra revocentur? Non est profecto in hominum commentis vel decretis facultas tanta, ut immutare rerum naturalem indolem conformationemque possint: quapropter parum sapienter publicam felicitatem interpretantur, qui germanam matrimonii

rationem impune perverti posse putant; et, qualibet sanctitate cum religionis tum Sacramenti posthabita, diffingere ac deformare coniugia ac deformare coniugia turpius velle videntur, quam ipsa ethniconum instituta consuevissent. Ideoque nisi consilia mutantur, perpetuo sibi metuere familiae et societas humana debebunt, ne miserrime coniciantur in illud rerum omnium certamen atque discrimen, quod est Socialistarum ac Communistarum flagitiosis gregibus iamdiu propositum.—Unde liquet quam absonum et absurdum sit publicam salutem a divortiis expectare, quae potius in certam societatis perniciem sunt evasura.

Igitur confitendum est, de communi omnium populorum bono meruisse optime Ecclesiam catholicam, sanctitati et perpetuitati coniugiorum tuendae semper intentam; nec exiguam ipsi gratiam deberi, quod legibus civicis centum iam annos in hoc genere multa peccantibus palam reclamaverit;\* quod haeresim deterrimam Protestantium de divortiis et repudiis anathemate perculerit;† quod usitatum graecis diremptionem matrimoniorum multis modis damnaverit;‡ quod irritas esse nuptias decreverit ea conditione initas, ut aliquando dissolvantur;§ quod demum vel a prima aetate leges imperatorias repudiavit, quae divortiis et repudiis perniciose favissent. || —Pontifices vero maximi quoties restiterunt principibus potentissimis, divortia a se facta ut rata Ecclesiae essent minaciter petentibus, toties existimandi sunt non modo pro incolumitate religionis, sed etiam pro humanitate gentium propugnasse. Quam ad rem omnis admirabitur posteritas invicti animi documenta a Nicolao I edita adversus Lotharium; ab Urbano II et Paschali II adversus Philippum I regem Galliarum; a Caelestino III et Innocentio III adversus Philippum II principem Galliarum; a Clemente VII et Paulo III adversus Henricum VIII; denique a Pio VII sanctissimo fortissimoque Pontifice adversus Napoleonem I, secundis rebus et magnitudine imperii exultantem.

Quae cum ita sint, omnes gubernatores administratoresque rerum publicarum, si rationem sequi, si sapientiam, si ipsam populorum utilitatem voluissent, malle debuerant sacras de matrimonio leges intactas manere, oblatumque Ecclesiae adiumentum in tutelam morum prosperitatemque familiarum adhibere, quam ipsam vocare Ecclesiam in suspicionem inimicitiae, et in falsam atque iniquam violati iuris civilis insimulationem.

Eoque magis, quod Ecclesia catholica, ut in re nulla potest ab religione officii et defensione iuris sui declinare, ita maxime solet esse ad benignitatem indulgentiamque proclivis in rebus omnibus, quae cum incolumitate iurium et sanctitate officiorum suorum possunt una

\* Pius VI, epist. ad episc. Lucion. 28 Maii 1793.—Pius VII, litter. encycl. die 17 Febr. 1809, et Const. dat. die 19 Iul. 1817.—Pius VIII, litt. encycl. die 29 Maii 1829.—Gregorius XVI, Const. dat. die 15 Augusti 1832.—Pius IX, alloc. habit. die 22 Sept. 1852.

† Trid. sess. xxiv, can. 5 et 7.

‡ Concil. Floren., et Instr. Eug. IV ad Armenos.—Bened. XIV, Const. *Et si pastoralis*, 6 Maii 1742.

§ Cap. 7 de condit. appos.

|| Hieron., epist. 79 ad Ocean.—Ambros., lib. viii in cap. 16 Lucae, n. 5.—August., de nuptiis cap. 10.

consistere. Quam ob rem nihil unquam de matrimoniis statuit, quin respectum habuerit ad statum communitalis, ad conditiones populorum; nec semel suarum ipsa legum praescripta, quoad potuit, mitigavit, quando ut mitigaret caussae iustae et graves impulerunt.—Item non ipsa ignorat neque diffitetur, sacramentum matrimonii, cum ad conservationem quoque et incrementum societatis humanae dirigatur, cognationem et necessitudinem habere cum rebus ipsis humanis, quae matrimonium quidem consequuntur, sed in genere civili versantur: de quibus rebus iure decernunt et cognoscunt qui rei publicae praesunt.

Nemo autem dubitat, quin Ecclesiae conditor Iesus Christus potestatem sacram voluerit esse a civili distinctam, et ad suas utramque res agendas liberam atque expeditam; hoc tamen adiuncto quod utrique expedit, et quod interest omnium hominum, ut coniunctio inter eas et concordia intercederet, in iisque rebus quae sint, diversa licet ratione, communis iuris et iudicii, altera, cui sunt humana tradita, opportune et congruenter ab altera penderet, cui sunt coelestia concredita. Huiusmodi autem compositione, ac fere harmonia, non solum utriusque potestatis optima ratio continetur, sed etiam opportunissimus atque efficacissimus modus iuvandi hominum genus in eo quod pertinet ad actionem vitae et ad spem salutis sempiternae. Etenim sicut hominum intelligentia, quemadmodum in superioribus Encyclicis Litteris ostendimus, si cum fide christiana conveniat, multum nobilitatur multoque evadit ad vitandos ac repellendos errores munitior, vicissimque fides non parum praesidii ab intelligentia mutuatur; sic pariter, si cum sacra Ecclesiae potestate civilis auctoritas amice congruat, magna utrique necesse est fiat utilitatis accessio. Alterius enim amplificatur dignitas, et, religione praeeunte, numquam erit non iustum imperium: alteri vero adiumenta tutelae et defensionis in publicum fidelium bonum suppeditantur.

Nos igitur, harum rerum consideratione permoti, cum studiose alias, tum vehementer in praesenti viros principes in concordiam atque amicitiam iungendam iterum hortamur; iisdemque paterna cum benevolentia veluti dexteram primi porrigimus, oblato supremae potestatis Nostrae auxilio, quod tanto magis est hoc tempore necessarium, quanto ius imperandi plus est in opinione hominum, quasi accepto vulnere, debilitatum. Incensis iam procaci libertate animis, et omne imperii, vel maxime legitimi, iugum nefario ausu detrectantibus, salus publica postulat, ut vires utriusque potestatis consocientur ad prohibenda damna, quae non modo Ecclesiae, sed ipsi etiam civili societati impendent.

Sed cum amicam voluntatum coniunctionem valde suademus, precamurque Deum, principem pacis, ut amorem concordiae in animos cunctorum hominum iniciat, tum temperare Nobis ipsi non possumus, quin Vestram industriam, Venerabiles Fratres, Vestrum studium ac vigilantiam, quae in Vobis summa esse intelligimus, magis ac magis hortando incitemus. Quantum contentione assequi, quantum auctoritate potestis, date operam, ut apud gentes fidei Vestrae commendatas integra atque incorrupta doctrina retineatur, quam Christus Dominus et coelestis voluntatis interpretes Apostoli

tradiderunt, quamque Ecclesia catholica religiose ipsa servavit, et a Christifidelibus servari per omnes aetates iussit.

Praecipuas curas in id insumate, ut populi abundant praeceptis sapientiae christianae, semperque memoria teneant matrimonium non voluntate hominum, sed auctoritate nutuque Dei fuisse initio constitutum, et hac lege prorsus ut sit unius ad unam: Christum vero novi Foederis auctorem illud ipsum ex officio naturae in Sacramenta transtulisse, et quod ad vinculum spectat, legiferam et iudicalem Ecclesiae suae adtribuuisse potestatem. Quo in genere cavendum magnopere est, ne in errorem mentes inducantur a fallacibus conclusionibus adversariorum, qui eiusmodi potestatem adeptam Ecclesiae vellent.—Similiter omnibus exploratum esse debet, si qua coniunctio viri et mulieris inter Christifideles citra Sacramentum contrahatur, eam vi ac ratione iusti matrimonii carere; et quamvis convenienter legibus civicis facta sit, tamen pluris esse non posse, quam ritum aut morem, iure civili introductum; iure autem civili res tantummodo ordinari atque administrari posse, quas matrimonia efferunt ex sese in genere civili, et quas gigni non posse manifestum est, nisi vera et legitima illarum caussa, scilicet nuptiale vinculum, existat.—Haec quidem omnia probe cognita habere maxime sponsorum refert, quibus etiam probata esse debent et notata animis, ut sibi liceat hac in re morem legibus genere; ipsa non abnuente Ecclesia, quae vult atque optat ut in omnes partes salva sint matrimoniorum effecta, et ne quid liberis detrimenti afferatur.—In tanta autem confusione sententiarum, quae serpunt quotidie longius, id quoque est cognitu necessarium, solvere vinculum coniugii inter christianos rati et consummati nullius in potestate esse; ideoque manifesti criminis reos esse, si qui forte coniuges, quaecumque demum caussa esse dicatur, novo se matrimonii nexu ante implicare velint, quam abrumpi primum morte contigerit.—Quod si res eo devenerint, ut convictus ferri diutius non posse videatur, tum vero Ecclesia sinit alterum ab altera seorsum agere, adhibendisque curis ac remediis ad coniugum conditionem accommodatis, lenire studet secessionis incommoda; nec umquam committit, ut de reconcilianda concordia aut non laboret aut desperet.—Verum haec extrema sunt; quo facile esset non descendere, si sponsi non cupiditate acti, sed praesumptis cogitatione tum officiis coniugum, tum caussis coniugiorum nobilissimis, ea qua aequum est mente ad matrimonium accederent; neque nuptias anteverterent continuatione quadam serieque flagitiorum, irato Deo. Et ut omnia paucis complectamur, tunc matrimonia placidam quietamque constantiam habitura sunt, si coniuges spiritum vitamque hauriant a virtute religionis, quae forti invictoque animo esse tribuit; quae efficit ut vitia, si qua sint in personis, ut distantia morum et ingeniorum, ut curarum maternas pondus, ut educationis liberorum operosa sollicitudo, ut comites vitae labores, ut casus adversi non solum moderate, sed etiam libenter perferantur.

Illud etiam cavendum est, ne scilicet coniugia facile appetantur cum alienis a catholico nomine: animos enim de disciplina religionis dissidentes vix sperari potest futuros esse cetera concordēs. Quin imo ab eiusmodi coniugiis ex eo maxime perspicitur esse abhorrendum,



quod occasionem praebeant vetitae societati et communicationi rerum sacrarum, periculum religioni creant coniugis catholici, impedimento sunt bonae institutioni liberorum, et persaepe animos impellunt, ut cunctarum religionum aequam habere rationem assuescant, sublato veri falsique discrimine.—Postremo loco, cum probe intelligamus, alienum esse a caritate Nostra neminem oportere, auctoritati fidei et pietati Vestrae, Venerabiles Fratres, illos commendamus, valde quidem miseros, qui aestu cupiditatum abrepti, et salutis suae plane immemores contra fas vivunt, haud legitimi matrimonii vinculo coniuncti. In his ad officium revocandis hominibus Vestra sollers industria versetur: et cum per Vos ipsi, tum interposita virorum bonorum opera, modis omnibus contendite, ut sentiant se flagitiose fecisse, agant nequitiae poenitentiam, et ad iustas nuptias ritu catholico ineundas animum inducant.

Haec de matrimonio christiano documenta ac praecepta, quae per has litteras Nostras Vobiscum, Venerabiles Fratres, communicanda censuimus, facile videtis, non minus ad conservationem civilis communitatis, quam ad salutem hominum sempiternam magnopere pertinere.—Faxit igitur Deus ut quanto plus habent illa momenti et ponderis, tanto dociles promptosque magis ad parendum animos ubique nanciscantur. Huius rei gratia, supplice atque humili prece omnes pariter opem imploremus beatæ Mariæ Virginis Immaculatae, quae, excitatis mentibus ad obediendum fidei, matrem se et adiutricem hominibus impertiat. Neque minore studio Petrum et Paullum obsecremus, Principes Apostolorum, domitores superstitionis, satores veritatis, ut ab eluvione renascentium errorum humanum genus firmissimo patrocinio tueantur.

Interea caelestium munerum auspicem et singularis benevolentiae Nostrae testem, Vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, et populis vigilantiae Vestrae commissis, Apostolicam Benedictionem ex animo impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum, die 10 Februarii an. 1880, Pontificatus Nostri Anno Secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

## THE POPE'S EDITION OF THE WORKS OF ST. THOMAS OF AQUIN.

LEO PP. XIII.

*Motu Proprio*

PLACERE Nobis, omnia Sancti Thomæ Aquinatis Opera de integro publicare, superiore anno significavimus per Litteras Nostras idibus octobribus datas ad Cardinalem Praefectum Sacri Consilii studiis disciplinarum regundis. Eiusqua caussam propositi hanc esse diximus, ut longe lateque fluat Angelici Doctoris excellens sapientia, qua opprimendis opinionibus perversis nostrorum temporum fere nihil est aptius, conservandæ veritati nihil efficacius. Nunc autem quia commodum videtur esse manum operi admovere, discernenda Nobis

nonnulla esse censemus, quae spem laetam portendunt, futurum ut coepta Nostra ad exitus pervehantur optatos.

Primum itaque, ne Almae Urbi Nostrae haec pereat laus, editionem, quam supra diximus, reservatum esse volumus Officinae librariae Sacri Consilii Christiano nomini propagando, clarae iam ob alia magnae molis et laudati operis edita volumina.

Editioni autem curandae destinamus ac praecipua auctoritate praeesse volumus tres sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinales; scilicet Antoninum de Luca Praefectum Sacri Consilii studiis regundis; Ioannem Simeoni Praefectum Sacri Consilii Christiano nomini propagando; Thomam Zigliara ex Familia Dominicana, ad disciplinam S. Thomae apprime institutum atque eruditum. His autem ius et potestas esto statuendi ac discernendi Nostro nomine quidquid ad rem pertinere intellexerint. Quare prospiciant ut omnia ac singula Angelici Doctoris Opera integra prodeant, additis clarissimorum Interpretum Thomae de Vio Cardinalis Caietani in *Summam Theologicam* et Francisci de Sylvestris Ferrariensis in *Summam contra Gentiles* commentariis. Similiter curent et provideant ne literarum optima forma, ne accurata emendatio, ne intelligens in rerum singularum delectu iudicium desideretur; ac demum constituent quo ordine, quo tempore singula volumina in lucem oporteat proferri.

Quod vero ad expensas attinet, argenteorum italicorum CCC millia Nos ultro damus atque addicimus suppeditandis sumptibus in praesenti necessariis. Reliquo autem tempore necessarios suppeditari volumus ex eiusdem Sacri Consilii Fidei propagandae aerario: cui tamen quidquid erit vendendis exemplaribus redactum pecuniae, tamdiu in rem cedat, quoad par ratio fuerit acceptorum et expensorum. Si quidquam eidem accrevisse contingat, accrescentem pecuniam omnem insumi iubemus in lucubrationes eorum Scriptorum edendas, qui S. Thomae Aquinatis illustrandis operibus maxime excellent. Cui vero inter illos scriptores decerni primas oporteat, viderint ipsi Cardinales quos nominavimus: hoc tantum monemus, eos scriptores esse ceteris anteponendos, quorum doctrina maiorem fructuum ubertatem sit allatura, et temporum necessitatibus accomodatior esse videatur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die 18 Ianuarii 1880. Pontificatus Nostri Anno Secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

## Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

### GERMAN PERIODICALS.

(By Dr. BELLESHEIM, of Cologne.)

#### 1. *Katholik*.

THE November issue contains an interesting dissertation by Professor Probst, of Breslau, on the so-called "Sacramentarium Leonianum." In 1735, Joseph Bianchini discovered in the library of Verona Cathedral a manuscript containing collects, secrets, prefaces, and other liturgical formularies, which he soon afterwards published under the name of "Codex Sacramentorum vetus S. Romanæ ecclesiæ a S. Leone papa confectus." Keen disputes soon began as to whether St. Leo had or had not compiled this collection, but all antiquarians agreed in calling it the oldest "Sacramentarium" of the Roman Church. The questions which Professor Probst seeks to answer are: Who was the pontiff in whose reign the collection appeared? Are any masses to be attributed to St. Damasus? Do these formularies agree with those of St. Gelasius and St. Gregory the Great? What masses are to be attributed to St. Leo? The author of this dissertation shows clearly that the collection, far from bearing an official character, is the work of a private person, and was brought out under Felix III. (483-492), St. Simplicius, his predecessor, being commemorated in one mass for the dead. That the collection belongs to the fifth century is also to be gathered from the fact of only a small number of "confessors" being admitted. The number of saints exhibited in the Sacramentarium is not large, and these for the most part are martyrs. The oldest part of the collection is shown by Dr. Probst to be attributed to St. Damasus (366-384). The reformation of the liturgy is known to belong to the second part of the fourth century. The time of persecutions having ceased, the liturgy began to bear a character very different from that of the pre-Constantinian time. A singularly striking example is supplied in the "Prefaces" of the reformed liturgy, which largely differ from the old prayers of thanksgiving for creation, providence, and redemption, and, on the contrary, lay the greatest stress on the celebration of the respective feasts and the commemoration of saints. From the history of the fourth century, it is clear that the reform of liturgy began in the time of Saints Basil, Ambrose, and Damasus. This fact seems to supply an obvious hint for inquiring whether the collection does not contain prayers which might be brought into connection with facts of Damasus's pontificate. That is really the case. St. Damasus was strongly opposed by the anti-Pope Ursicinus, or Ursinus, the number of whose partisans was not small, and it seems to be to these factious men that the preface of one mass (July) refers:—"Qui coelestibus

disciplinis nos instruens, qualiter a fidelibus tuis falsos fratres discernemus ostendens, Unigeniti tui voce pronuntias, ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos." "De his sunt inflati sensu carnis suæ, et non tenentes caput . . . . sæpe subvertere conati sunt et conantur." These and other sentences make it very probable that at least these masses must be attributed to St. Damasus. Another striking fact is given in page 326 of our collection, where we find, for the Feast of St. John Baptist, four masses, the fourth being inscribed "*ad fontem*," indicating that the sacrament of baptism may be administered on that day. Comparing this with the well authenticated fact that Pope Siricius, the successor of Damasus, answered the question of Himerius of Tarragona, whether or not it was allowed to baptize on feasts of apostles and martyrs, by forbidding him to do so, except in case of urgent necessity, and reminding him of Easter and the fifty following days, when only baptism was to be given, we gather that in the reign of Damasus this sacrament began to be administered on the Feast of St. John, and hence may assign to his period the origin of the formulary. St. Leo III. has only a small share in the collection, but two prefaces, one for the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, the other for the month of July, convince an attentive reader that their author was the same person who wrote Sermon 84, attributed to St. Leo. III. In the same issue I contributed a succinct commentary on De Rossi's famous dissertation on the "*Sancti quatuor Coronati*." This topic is not less intricate than interesting, but was so thoroughly treated by the eminent Roman archaeologist, that we may confidently now call it "*causa finita*." The acts of these saints, in the course of time, underwent, on the part of hagiologists and historiographers, no very favourable treatment. Surius declined to admit them in the "*Vitæ probatorum Sanctorum*;" Cardinal Baronius only gave vent to his desire of a more accurate text, and Tillemont did his utmost to deprive the acts of all kind of authority, calling them the offspring of barbarous times. But German Protestant antiquarians in our days have passed quite an opposite judgment on the text; and, complying with their desire, Commendatore de Rossi began to examine it with his well-known sagacity. If we reproduced his dissertation, we should trespass beyond the space assigned to us; it may suffice to touch briefly on the result of his inquiries. The actual text of the acts is made up of two separate parts, afterwards mixed up in the Middle Ages, the first originating in Pannonia (Hungary), the other being composed in Rome. The Pannonian part describes the works and martyrdom of five sculptors in the imperial mines of Pannonia, where they shaped the marble into "*Victorias, cupidines, et conchas*" for the imperial palaces. But, declining to sculpture the image of Aesculapius, the Emperor Diocletian commanded them to be put to death. It is excessively interesting to follow the subtle deductions of De Rossi, who employs, in support of the Acts, the most authentic results of modern German philology. It is principally the legislation on the imperial mines he makes an extensive use of. The same Emperor afterwards, in Rome, sentenced to death *four Christian soldiers* (*cornicularii*), and their martyrdom is described in the *second*

part of the Acts. These martyrs being anonymous, and having suffered on the same day, but not in the same year with the Pannonian sculptors, their feasts began to be celebrated together. It was Pope Melchisedes who so ordered, and the place where the commemoration used to be held was "tertio milliario via Labicana in comitatu ad duas lauros." The very important fact that the Almanack of Dionysius Furius Philocalus contains the names of our Pannonian saints is explained by Codex 93 in the Chapter Library of Verona, indicating that their relics, two years after the martyrdom, were brought from Pannonia to Rome and there entombed, together with the four Roman soldiers. It was Leo IV. (847-855) who, before he became Pope, held the title of the Ancient Church of the Caelian, and afterwards carried the holy relics of both groups of martyrs to this church, which henceforward was called "Ad SS. Quatuor Coronatos." The January issue contains a good treatise of Rev. Dr. Grube on the principles of the interpretation of Holy Scripture employed by St. Justin, who defended the Christian religion against the attacks of the Jews in his "Dialogue with Tryphon."

2. *Historisch-politische Blätter*.—The January issue has a Paper, contributed by Dr. von Schafhaentl, professor at Munich, which has a special interest for Scotland and Scottish Benedictines. When King Macbeth, in the eleventh century, expelled the Benedictines, they took refuge on the Continent, and settled, first in Cologne and afterwards in Ratisbon. The latter town soon became a centre for the missionary works of the Scottish monks, who spread all over Germany. Following their great traditions, they opened a higher school at Ratisbon, which, after the disastrous ecclesiastical revolution of Knox, supplied Scotland with many priests. There are still not a few priests in Scotland who were educated in the Benedictine convent at Ratisbon. In 1817 some of the Fathers brought back with them from Scotland young John Lamont, born, in 1803, near Aberdeen, the second son of a Catholic farmer. During his course of Philosophy, the intelligent youth gave ample proofs of his talents; but above all he manifested a special gift for mathematics and mechanical art, and as these sciences, in preference to all others, were cultivated by the prior, Father Deasson, he was especially favoured by him, and destined to higher studies. He became assistant to the observer in the Royal Observatory, Munich, and in course of time, by the vote of the President of the Royal Academy, Professor von Schelling (the philosopher), was appointed to be first observer. This gave origin to his "*Observationes Astronomice in Specula Regia Monacensi Instituta et Regio jussu publicis impensis editae XV. vol.*" The minor dissertations on the science of astronomy which he wrote are almost numberless, and are not yet collected. In 1850 he began to observe the so-called "telescope" stars. He was a member of many literary societies, the Royal Society of London having elected him as early as 1843. After a long and painful illness, this eminent man expired August 6, 1879. Besides the admiration he may claim for the great services he rendered to the science of astronomy, he is still more to be venerated for his steadfast character, eminent moral virtues, and principally for his obedience and fidelity

as a son of the Catholic Church. The same issue has a long account of Prince Metternich's Memoirs.

3. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*.—In the November issue Father Langhorst vindicates Cardinal Turre Cremata's doctrine about the origin of episcopal jurisdiction from an attack it had to suffer last year in Germany. His doctrine is, that bishops derive their jurisdiction immediately from the Pope; and this doctrine, strongly brought into prominence by the great Dominican Cardinal, was the common doctrine of the Mediæval Doctors, although neither the Council of Trent nor that of the Vatican passed any decision on the question. Cardinal Hergenröther, in his work, "The Catholic Church and the Christian State" (p. 880, German edit.), adduces for this doctrine ninety theologians and canonists. Father Ehrle contributes an exposition on the Encyclical "Aeterni Patris," in which Leo XIII. urges on the clergy the study of St. Thomas's works. Father Langhorst discusses the Punishment of Death as justified and supported by the principles of natural right; and Father Cathrein comments on the social condition of workmen in England.

4. The *Görres-Gesellschaft*, for cultivating Catholic science in Germany, started in January the first issue of a new Historical Review, under the name of "Historisches Jahrbuch," which will be published four times a year, and is intended to clear up the innumerable mistakes about Catholicism wilfully repeated by many non-Catholic modern historiographers. The first Number opens with an essay "from the Papers of the Cardinal of York," by Baron von Reumont. Twenty years ago the same learned author brought out, in two volumes, his work on the "Countess of Albany," describing the last Stuarts, Prince Charles and his brother, Henry Benedict, Cardinal of York. The Papers of the Cardinal were given, in 1817, by Cardinal Consalvi to the Prince Regent of England, afterwards George IV.; but some documents remained in Rome, where our author had occasion to become acquainted with them. Their interest is chiefly of a private nature. Baron von Reumont concludes his learned essay by remarking that in 1871, on a visit in Naples, he saw the Cardinal's portrait, painted by the great Roman artist Pompeo Batoni, a contemporary of Raphael Mengs, and urges that, "considering the twofold dignity of the last Stuart and King Henry IX., non consiliis hominum, sed Dei voluntate, the Cardinal's portrait ought not to be absent from the London National Gallery." The history of the Stuarts, just at this moment, is the subject of eager discussion in Germany. Dr. Onno Klopp has now published volumes seven and eight of his excellent work, "The Downfall of the House of Stuart and Succession of the House of Hanover in Great Britain and Ireland in connection with European Affairs." Onno Klopp, although more than once asked to put another title, more suggestive of the rich contents, on his book, constantly declined to do so. Departing from most historiographers, English as well as French, he intends describing principally the immense influence brought to bear on the settlement of European affairs by William III., of Great Britain. This monarch, together with the Emperor Leopold I., are the main figures in Klopp's work, and it is their immense services to Europe,



in checking the baneful politics of Louis XIV., that the author seeks to display to the world.

# ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

*La Civiltà Cattolica.* 17 Gennaio, 7 Febbraio, 1880.

## *A Satanic School of Poetry.*

IN the above Numbers of *La Civiltà Cattolica*, we have an account of a new school of poetry which has sprung up in Italy—if the name of school can be applied to the versification, in every possible form, with which it has been deluged for these last two or three years. In a preface to the “Nuove Poesie” of Giosuè Carducci, who seems to be recognised as the leader of the versifiers according to the new style, Panzacchi, himself one of the tribe, calls this poetical revival throughout the land “a new spring,” and “a literary re-blossoming,” but he concludes with observing that, apart from artistic merits, the new-born muse must not be too strictly interrogated as to the paths which it pursues, or the ends at which it aims. These, it seems, would be impertinent questions. As regards *art*, Panzacchi allows that it would be different; as if art could be regarded independently of its form and aims. The new poets of Italy, in fact, do not relish those two questions, for very obvious reasons—the shameless obscenity and demoniacal impiety with which their lucubrations are fraught. These expressions are by no means exaggerated, for it is not merely that their productions are occasionally open to this reproach, but that the most disgusting immorality and appalling atheism constitute their staple theme. In short, the new poetry may be described as the orgies of the human intellect, and the saturnalia of the fancy. Art, or all that as yet has been regarded as deserving of the name, is, indeed, as much set at defiance as religion and morality by these poetasters who seem to glory in treading under foot all the traditions bequeathed by the most sublime geniuses of the Italian Parnassus. The reviewer illustrates this last assertion by a few quotations from Carducci’s poems. They are quite untranslatable, were they worth the labour, and outrage good taste and common sense so flagrantly that one may well wonder how poetic effusions, of which these passages form a specimen, can find acceptance with the public. The press, however, is inundated with little volumes, all twin brethren of Carducci’s, in attractive covers, printed on delicate paper in minute characters, which seem ashamed of what they have to express—and well may they be—on pages with wide margins, so that two-thirds of the space are left empty. Such is the style in which these choice morsels are served up; and, unfortunately, there is a wide-spread, corrupt taste, which is able to relish them.

If such is the dress of the new school, what is its aim? Chiarini, one of their number, clearly states this in his Preface to Carducci’s “Odi Barbare”—an appropriate title, it must be allowed. He is engaged in confuting the assertion of such as had reproached Carducci with resuscitating Paganism, which for centuries had descended

to the grave. "No," he says, "Paganism is not dead. . . . That which prevented the death of Paganism has a name more ancient and greater than that of Carducci, greater also than that of Christ; it is called Human Nature." Then, after many blasphemies, the infernal character of which he endeavours to disguise under elegant phraseology, and a show of scientific reasoning, he concludes thus:—"Let us humbly confess it; we are no longer Christians, we are Pagans; we wish to live and enjoy life, we wish to obey our nature . . . . thus fulfilling the law of our being." "Such," he says, "is the meaning of the complaints of Schiller, Leopardi, Swinburne, Carducci." "Yes," he repeats, "we are Pagans, and we may glory in it, because the Paganism of the 'Odi Barbare' is, as Alberto Mino judiciously observed, not merely the revindication of earth over heaven, not merely the abolition of all the mediæval darkness of Christianity—that inveterate plague of civil society—but the serene, the full, the satisfying possession of earthly life, a content which results from the acquisition of the key of its secrets and laws."

Naturalism, materialism, epicureanism, such form the scope of the new Italian poetry. It shamelessly confesses the same, and the apostate Professor Trezza, when lauding the "Odi Barbare," does not care to defend them from the charge of Epicureanism, but blasphemously adds that the author, musing on Rome, the creator of Mediterranean civilization, rebels against the Galilean, who cast a cross into his arms and said, "Take it, and serve." Against this service the modern conscience is rebelling; it was time, therefore, that lyric song should interpret it, and contemporary poets break away from an old faith whose sun has set for ever. The avowed end may well dub itself "barbarism;" it is the burning of the old cathedrals, the grinding to powder of old saints, the destruction of all the ancient glories of Italy, the annihilation of Christianity, theoretical and practical, and of all the art born of and fostered by it. Christ preached cruel doctrines, the mortification of the flesh, the subjugation of the senses, the submission of reason to faith, of nature to grace; doctrines whereby joy and laughter were banished from the earth, and fear and melancholy were engendered.

The new school, then, luxuriates in the rehabilitation of the flesh, in the victory of natural instincts, and in the triumph of Satan, who is to them the symbol of their rebellion, and to whom adulatory verses are not seldom addressed. In this, the ultimate aim of the revolution, the supreme object of the Masonic sects, all these poets coincide, although many—and these, indeed, constitute the majority—would dispense with the paraphernalia of heathen gods or goddesses, nymphs and dryads, in which Carducci delights, deeming them necessary poetic accessories and, as such, useful means to bring about the Satanic triumph, and rush straight to the most revolting license of the imagination and to the loathsome glorification of sensual indulgence. "Close my excommunicated book"—such is the exordium of one of these poets, addressing the critics of these scandalous exhibitions—"for it might tell you how fair sinful women are and how sweet is sin."

But every school must have a name; this school could not be

called Classicist, aiming, as do all its followers, at dethroning from their seats of honour, those who have been hitherto regarded as classic models, Dante, Tasso, Petrarch, and the rest. Romanticism they abhor, and they do not sufficiently agree to allow of their selecting any common representative name from amongst themselves; the school has, therefore, been distinguished by the appellation of "Verismo," on account of its professed homage to Truth, and its disciples have been styled Veristi (Verists), a name which some reject as calumnious, on what ground it is hard to say—although it might well be viewed as satirical. Let us, however, if any object to being called Verists, style them Realists, a name suitable to men who make war on idealism. They have, they say, "been awakened from ecstatic mediæval hallucinations and have thrown away the Manzonian husk"—an allusion to Manzoni, whom they abominate—in order to "launch themselves into society and purify themselves in the infinite bosom of Nature." With the so-called mediæval hallucinations and the husk à la Manzoni, they have, however, cast away all the true greatness and beauty of Italian poetry, and, indeed, of all poetry whatever. Religious belief and feeling were always among the chief inspirers of art, and with the loss of faith art has always sunk or degenerated. Moreover, the avowed object of art is to give pleasure, and when intellectual instruction and elevation are combined therewith, it attains the height of perfection. But what kind of pleasure is it to give? Surely not sensuous pleasure, which can never elevate the mind, and is proper for beasts rather than for men. The delight which it is the object of art to produce is a human delight, a delight decorous and moral in its character Aristotle said as much. But see how Guerrini and his compeers scoff at those who reproach their licentious songs with outrageous morality!

Thus despoiled of the elements of true beauty, religion and morality, what can remain in the poetry of even one gifted with poetic talent but the deepest moral degradation or the hysterical utterance of melancholy and despair, such as was poured forth by poor Leopardi, who was made for better things had he not lost his faith? He sings, and his hymn is a groan of despair; he seems to smile, and he weeps; he seems to love, and he hates, curses, and imprecates. He curses himself, God, his fellow-creatures, Nature, everything. A heavy account lies at the door of the men who are striving to popularize among the rising generation of their country a poetry which destroys art and becomes to them an instrument of death, converting every youth of twenty into a sort of melancholy desperado, who tastes in the flower of his days all the bitterness of a miserable old age. It is a poetry which professes to sing only about reality, but which loses itself amidst the wildest and most fantastic dreams, repulsive to common sense, and divested of every true grace and pure enjoyment. All is then a lie in this poetry, and, being as it is, the child of the Revolution, it could not be ought save false and destructive. Its goal is a moral dunghill, and it can occasionally speak the truth by confessing as much. Witness the following strophe of Stecchetti:

Ma noi giacciamo nauseati e stracchi,  
Senza un affetto in cor, sul reo letame  
Di questa sozzo età. Noi siamo vigliacchi,

which may be thus rendered: "But we lie sickened and wearied, without an affection in the heart, on the wretched dunghill of this filthy age. We are vile creatures." True; only the reviewer, quoting some words of Cavallotti, spoken on another occasion, adds, "Would he do us the favour to speak in the singular number?"

### FRENCH PERIODICALS.

*Revue des Questions Historiques.* Janvier, 1880. Paris.

*Louis XIV. and Clement IX., in the Affair of the Two Marriages of Mary of Savoy, 1666-1668.* By M. CH. GÉRIN.

THIS Article is the fruit of much reading amongst documents and "papers," and is interesting to theologians as illustrating Papal action with regard to Matrimonial Dispensations. Limited space allows us here only an outline of the Article: it bristles with quotations and references.

On the 27th June, 1666, Mary, the daughter of Charles Amadeus of Savoy, Duc de Nemours and d'Aumale, was married by proxy to Alphonsus VI., King of Portugal, and three days afterwards left France for Lisbon. Louis XIV. had disposed of her hand, hoping to rule Portugal against Spain through the young queen. Alphonsus is described as a "physical and moral monster"—he was imbecile and impotent. On 21st November, 1667, she entered a convent, declaring that she would remain there, and that the king knew their marriage was null, &c. After some blustering, Alphonsus admitted the charge, and, later on, signed the admission. The States were assembled, and he further consented that his brother, Don Pedro, should share in the government of the kingdom, of which he himself was incapable.

Alphonsus was put aside entirely, and Don Pedro made king; and on 31st March, 1668, the same Mary of Savoy was married to Don Pedro, the brother of her first husband. These are familiar facts. It has not been so clear as to whether the second marriage was regular; whether the nullity of the first was duly pronounced by competent ecclesiastical authority; what part the Pope took herein. The Article replies to these points of doubt. Voltaire's sneer is ("Siècle de Louis XIV." chap. x.) "that the surprising thing is not that the Pope should have given a Bull of Dispensation, but that such powerful persons should have needed it;" that the Vatican "had always two measures for the rights of kings and of subjects," &c.

It was both law and custom that the dispensations needed should be asked of Rome: the queen wished it to be so asked. But Louis XIV., for motives chiefly political, wished they should *not* be asked of Rome, and he carried his way. The Portuguese prelates pronounced on the nullity of the first marriage; and the King of France urged them also to grant the dispensation, as application to Rome necessitated long

delays, &c. They hesitated; when suddenly there arrived from Louis a dispensation granted by the Papal Legate in France in the Pope's name! Almost before the Portuguese bishops had time carefully to read it, the marriage was performed; and then, as soon as it was over, both prelates and princes, with uneasy consciences, read it again. It came from Cardinal de Vendôme. This man, at the age of fifty-five, and when still a layman, had been presented by the French king for the Cardinalate. He had neither knowledge nor aptitude, and during his stay in Rome was the laughing-stock of all, "even of the French Embassy." Ignorant and pliant, the king persuaded him that he had power as legate to grant the dispensation to a queen out of his jurisdiction of France. "Reversing the Gallican custom of disputing and restricting the powers of Pontifical envoys, Louis XIV. succeeded in still more deeply wounding the Holy See, by forcing a legate to an abuse of jurisdiction." Even this legate sent afterwards to Rome to justify himself that he had done it only because forced to it by the king.

The Queen insisted on the affair being honestly reported to Rome, and the due rectification being demanded from the Holy Father, in opposition to the King of France, who vehemently opposed anything more than a petition for the approval and confirmation from the Pope of what had been done. Louis, whose language to his ambassadors and agents is throughout painfully contemptuous towards the Pope's spiritual action, wrote, among many other letters, one to his ambassador, explaining that he had been *obliged* to make the legate use his powers in an affair of great importance, which could not wait for Rome to be written to, and expressed the hope that when this had been mentioned to the Pope he "would rest satisfied with this little affair." But the Pope would take no step until the whole case was properly submitted to him *ab initio*. Ambassadors, agents, priests used every effort: the Pope was firm against both intrigue and menace. He appointed a special congregation of nine members to try the cause, and, when finally all the details had been laid before him, declared the first marriage *non consummatum* and null, and granted the dispensation from the impediment *publicæ honestatis, in radice*, to the joy of the Queen, for her own honour's sake and that of her child soon to be born.

---

*Revue Catholique.* 15 Janvier, 1880. Louvain.

"UN prêtre civilisateur," an article by M. Henri Lefebvre, deserves to be made known. It records a noble work of regeneration accomplished in our own days by a priest who appears to have not a little of the energy and spirit of the Curé of Ars.

Jonkersville is the name of a hamlet of the Commune of Woumen, in the *Arrondissement* of Dixmude (in West Flanders). "Jonkersville was, a few years ago, the most savage, the least civilized place in all Belgium. Situated anciently in the midst of immense forests, the remains of which are still called '*Vrybosch*' (Free Wood), this hamlet was quite recently inhabited by a population among whom

misery and grossness disputed for supremacy with immorality. In darksome cabins lived some hundreds of beggars and robbers; for these wretched people were all of the one profession." They were the dread of the country round. "Yet it was in Belgium, and in the second half of the nineteenth century, so proud of its lights, that such degradation existed without any one attempting a remedy." Immorality was rife; the restraints of the nearest relationship were not respected; sixty-five per cent. of their children were illegitimate. The nearest churches were, it is fair to say, scarcely to be reached, from the state of the roads, during a great portion of the year; and both mass and the sacraments were quite neglected. It need not be added that their children were never seen at a school. Such was Jonkershove in 1862, when a zealous priest, finding himself (providentially) without a mission, went thither determined with God's help to convert its inhabitants.

This was M. Costenoble, a Belgian, who had gone out to Chili at twenty-two years of age. In Chili, Bolivia, the Argentine Republic, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, California, he worked for twelve years—giving Missions, rousing Catholics, making converts. The glimpses here given of his missionary and travelling experiences are highly interesting. Chili became his adopted country, and there he had hoped to live and die, but his arduous labours had broken down his health, and medical men said the only remedy was his native air. Reluctantly he bade adieu to the scenes of his apostolate and to his devoted spiritual children in the new world; his leaving them was not unlike St. Paul's departure from Miletus. Thus in 1862, and at thirty-six years of age, he found himself in Bruges, convalescent, and with means to live independently of work—thanks to the funds spontaneously made over to him by Chilian friends in grateful return for his self-sacrificing services to them. He looked around for a new field of service in his master's vineyard, and felt sure he saw it in Jonkersville. He went there, and began the building of a school for boys and girls, and a church in the midst of the people. This was opened in August, 1864, and he then took up his permanent residence next to it. These were material beginnings; for a spiritual change among such a population, an extraordinary charity and heroic zeal were needed, and they were forthcoming. At first there was declared hostility. "The inhabitants received their benefactor, with very much the amenity of wild animals towards the trainer entering their cage." They sullenly took his alms, but repelled his advances, refused to send their children to school; menaces were not wanting, and even recently some of the few who still held out tried to frighten him away,—but a long suffering, patient charity, has under God, triumphed over all resistance.

There is a population of some 200 households,—1400 souls in round numbers. Now everyone works, mendicity has been banished. The chief occupations are agricultural labour, clearing the woods of the "Vrybosch," and road-making. The six proprietors of that portion of country have helped the Curé, but neither Government nor Commune has co-operated in anything. The school attendance is



large in winter, sparse in summer, when many of the children are at field-work; the minimum attendance is 150 boys, and 120 girls. Nearly everyone can now read and write. Illegitimate births are now not one per cent. Masses are well attended. On one Sunday a month they go to Holy Communion, the men, women, boys, and girls having each their separate Sunday. They thus form four congregations, each one of which, on its own Communion Sunday, hears from the Curé a discourse addressed exclusively to itself, and bearing on the special duties and dangers of each. To these familiar instructions the great success of M. Costenoble is to be attributed. In the ceremonial of the greater feasts the people take special delight; they form a source of imaginative and spiritual pleasures that wonderfully aid them to rise above their former gross enjoyments. But, finally M. le Curé "does not forbid them worldly amusements. He encourages honest games, especially those which fatigue the body while they excite interest and emulation. On fête-days he offers prizes—objects of utility or comfort. In short, he neglects no occasion of turning all things to good." This change from vice and misery has been effected in less than twenty years by the strong will, aided by Divine grace, of one zealous priest. M. Henri Lefebvre recommends those who doubt any part of this story, to do as he did—go to Jonkersville and see for themselves.

---

## Science Notices.

---

**The Panama Canal.**—From the various schemes laid before the Panama Canal Commission we select two, which are typical of the others. In the first plan proposed the length of the canal would be about forty-three miles, width twenty-four yards, and depth nine. The time to be employed in its construction was estimated at six years, and the cost about 20,000,000*l*. This scheme possessed the advantage of being the cheapest, but it laboured under the serious drawback of including a large number of locks in the route proposed. These would have necessitated a great waste of time in the passage of ships from one ocean to the other, besides the liability to go out of order, and the consequent block in the traffic. The second scheme obviated this objection by proposing a route which required no locks, but included other difficulties of a serious character—namely, the fluctuating depth of water in the channel, the rapid current caused by the inrush of the Pacific tide, and also the flooding of the canal by the river Chagres, which in this scheme has no other outlet to the Atlantic except through the canal. From calculations made by the Commission, and from personal observation of flowing tides in the neighbouring rivers, it was estimated that the current in the canal would reach a velocity of four or five knots an hour, and thus the friction on the banks would be so great that in a short time the channel would be choked up with the *débris*. A canal on the sea level is impossible, in the estimation of the

Commission, unless a large and strong barrier, or lock, be erected on the Pacific coast to regulate the admission of water into the channel. A harbour of large extent should also be constructed within this barrier, communicating with the sea by three outlets. This lock, in the estimation of the Commissioners, would be no serious obstacle to navigation, as it would be, in effect, docking, which vessels are subjected to in nearly all the large ports of the world. After the construction of a harbour on the Pacific coast, the frequent flooding of the river Chagres next engaged the attention of the Commission. It was estimated that an ordinary flood would raise the level of the water from fifteen to twenty-five feet, and thus necessitate a corresponding elevation of the banks. Besides, the current would, in a flood, acquire such force as totally to prevent all traffic. These facts led the Commission to conclude that the canal should at all cost be kept free from any communication with the river Chagres. Messrs. Wyse and Reclus, the authors of the scheme, attempted to overcome the difficulty by the following expedient :—They proposed a reservoir, to hold the overflow of the Chagres in flood-time, and so regulate the flow from it that the current would acquire but little fresh velocity. The Commissioners were, however, still of opinion that this increase of water, regulated as it was, taken in conjunction with the increased volume of water poured into the canal by other streams in flood-time, would cause a serious obstacle to the passage of ships. Besides, there was a continual danger of this enormous body of water bursting through any barriers, however strong, and causing great destruction of life and property. The projectors finally proposed to construct a completely independent channel for the Chagres at a cost of about 2,000,000*l*. The advantages of this second plan were that it obviated the necessity for locks. Excellent harbours already existed at both extremities of the canal; and the port of Colon and the Panama railway offered unusual facilities for the transport of all necessary materials. The work of construction is estimated to occupy twelve years, and cost about 43,000,000*l*. When finished, the time occupied in passing from one ocean to the other will be two days. The Commission approved, in substance, of this scheme.

**Nordenskiöld's Expedition.**—In this expedition, after exploring the mouth of the Lena, Professor Nordenskiöld directed his course to the Archipelago of New Siberia. This group of islands is peculiarly valuable in a scientific point of view, by reason of the enormous quantities of bones of various animals which they contain. Skeletons of the mammoth are so abundant that collectors come annually from the mainland to collect the ivory tusks, and return in the autumn laden with the spoil. Skeletons of the rhinoceros, the horse, and the bison, are common. The further exploration of these islands is destined to shed a great light on those vast scientific problems which are now demanding solution, regarding the distribution of animal life on the surface of the globe. Sailing towards the East he found his course blocked with ice, and was forced to take a northerly course. The inhabitants of an island near which the *Vega* anchored, came on

board, but unfortunately could not speak any European language. The people lived in large tents containing one or two spacious compartments or alcoves for beds. These alcoves were a species of inner tent, constructed of reindeer's skin, warmed and lighted by lamps of seal oil in summer, and in winter by a large wood fire in the centre of the outer tent. The children seem to be treated with great kindness and attention. When clothed they looked like a bundle of furs, but in the inner tent they ran about without any clothes. Professor Nordenskiöld saw them in this state run over the frozen ground from one tent to another at a temperature below zero. After touching at various points and collecting a large amount of eminently useful scientific information, and at the expense of much labour and hardship, the main object of the expedition was attained by the discovery of the North-west Passage.

**Mr. Edison's Electric Lamp.**—In our number for July of last year we said that no one had yet succeeded in bringing forward an electric light suitable for domestic purposes. The New York newspapers, of December last, announced that Mr. Edison had succeeded. The most interesting portion of Mr. Edison's discovery is his new lamp—"the contrivances of which are so absurdly simple as to seem almost an anti-climax to the laborious process of invention by which they were reached. A small glass globe, from which the air has been exhausted, two platinum wires, and a bit of charred paper"—this is the lamp.

It is generally known that electric lights have been produced on the following principle: When a strong electric current passes along a circuit, if it encounters in that circuit a small solution of continuity it will leap the chasm, and describe between the extremities of the solution a luminous curve known as the voltaic arc; or, if it encounters a less conductive body, it instantly heats up the last to luminosity, and this is called the light from an incandescent solid. In the former method the difficulty is to keep sufficiently near together the extremities of the separated wires which are destroyed by the heat. In the latter method the difficulty has been to find a solid capable of sustaining white heat without melting.

Mr. Edison's lamp is a form of incandescent solid. This lamp is a glass globe, rather over two inches in diameter, with a short stem resembling a large decanter stopper. Into the stem enters the wire which brings in the electric current, and opposite to it is a second wire by which the used current is discharged. The wires support a horse-shoe-shaped loop of carbonised paper, to each end of which they are fastened. When the current is sent into the lamp by the conducting wire, this narrow strip of charred paper becomes the incandescent solid, and gives light without being itself destroyed. This is the most marvellous feature in the whole discovery. The process by which paper is rendered serviceable for this purpose is simple. "The horse-shoe loops are cut from cardboard and placed in layers, within an iron box, with tissue-paper between; the box is hermetically sealed, and then raised to a red heat. Nothing remains but the carbon loops

and the carbonised tissue-paper. All other forms of carbon previously used had presented the difficulty of containing air or gas." When thus prepared the carbonised paper is found to be perfectly "homogeneous in structure, elastic, tough, and of an almost vitreous cleavage. It is strong enough to stand far more strain than will be put upon it in any ordinary use. If this paper were burned in air, or in a vacuum prepared by a common air-pump, it would, of course, be almost instantly destroyed. In a high vacuum it burns, but is never consumed. The small glass globe which holds the simple apparatus is exhausted of air by nearly the same combination of the Sprengel and Geissler mercury pumps used by Crookes in making his radiometer, or 'light mill,' and in his wonderful discovery of the phenomena of radiant matter in high vacuums, recently brought before the Royal Society." The horse-shoe form of this paper was adopted in order to approximate the shape of the light to that of a gas jet. Its size, too, is large enough to cause the edges of the shadows to be softened down; and thus it obviates the common objection to familiar forms of electric lighting.

"The difficulty of subdivision Mr. Edison has also overcome. In his method of illumination a number of separate lights can now be supplied from the same wire, and each one, being independent, can be lighted or extinguished without affecting those near it. Mr. Edison's idea of the electric light was that, in all respects, it should take the place of gas. As water is pumped into pipes which convey it under pressure to the point where it is to be used, so the electricity is to be forced into the wires and delivered under pressure at its destination. In the case of water, after being used, it flows away by means of a sewer-pipe and is lost. But it is easy to imagine that the water used in working machinery, for instance, instead of being lost, might be returned to the pumps, and used over and over again. With such a system as this we should have a perfect analogy to the Edison electric lighting system. The electricity, after being distributed under pressure and used, is returned to the central station. As the light results from no consumption of a material, but is mere transmutation of the energy exerted in the pumping process, it is therefore seen that all which is essential to an electric lighting system is the generator (or pump), the two lines of wire, one distributing the electricity, the other bringing it back, and a lamp which transmutes into light the energy carried by the electricity when it passes from one wire to the other, and in which the energy of the pressure expresses itself as the light. In Edison's invention the amount of electricity delivered in the lamp is determined by the size and resistance in the carbon, just as in water the amount of flow is determined by the size of the openings. As a great many small jets of water can be supplied from one pipe, so a great many lamps or small escapes for electricity can be furnished from one wire."

Mr. Edison has also invented a new generator, to be called, in honour of the great physicist, "the Faradic generator." He proposes to mass a number of these together in "central stations; each station will be enough to feed the lamps of a large district. Each of the

numerous generators in a central station will pump electricity from its own wire to a large common one, and this will conduct the current into sheets and houses. Before passing into the house, the electricity is carried into a sort of meter containing a safety-valve, by means of which it can be measured. This electricity meter is another discovery of Mr. Edison, and although very ingenious, does not appear to be so simple in its working as it will doubtless, if needed, eventually become.

The wires by which houses, &c., will be supplied with the food of their lamps will be laid in fascines or bundles under the edge of the sidewalk in a tight box. The object of this is to make them easy of access and easy to place in position. Nor is there need of putting them out of the reach of the frost, for they are continuous and not liable to leak from change in position. Even more important is the fact that the colder the wires are the less is the waste of electricity, thus giving a decided advantage over gas in winter, when most light is needed. It is proposed to colour the distributing wires red and the waste wires green. These two distinct wires will be carried all through the house, and every lamp will be so placed that the electricity will flow through it from one wire to the other. The electric light thus provided for is to cost less than gas, and the light of one of the small lamps described can be made equal in power to twelve gas jets.

In an account of the light in "Scribner's Monthly" for February, from which these details have been largely borrowed, and which has been approved of by Mr. Edison himself, there is not a suspicion breathed of any difficulties yet to be overcome. Yet difficulties neither light nor few are urged on all hands against the practicability of Mr. Edison's scheme. It is objected that the carbonised paper will eventually be consumed; that by the frequent dilatation and sudden cooling the glass globes will allow air to enter and mix with the carbon. A French electrician, M. du Moncel, who had made, before Edison, experiments with vegetable paper as an incandescent substance, treats the invention as an American *canard*. Two objections appear to be fatal—the fragility of the electrode of paper, and the difficulty of completely extracting air from the globes. With reference to the last named, it appears that Edison himself has stopped the manufacture of glass globes until he shall have conducted further experiments.

---

#### BOOKS OF SCIENCE AND TRAVEL.

*A Few Months in New Guinea.* By OCTAVIUS C. STONE, F.R.G.S.  
Illustrated. London: Sampson Low. 1880.

**E**VEN now, little is known of New Guinea. Geographers now say that it is the largest island in the world, surpassing in size Borneo. According to Mr. Stone's calculations, which are as likely to be right as any other (p. 204), its population is under two and a half millions. "A Few Months in New Guinea" is not a profound work, nor a very startling one, but it strikes us as being as thoroughly truthful as it is

simple. And it adds something more to what was already known about New Guinea. During Mr. Stone's sojourn in New Guinea, he seems never to have got out of sight of Mount Owen Stanley, and to have confined his explorations to the south-eastern promontory. He visited some half-dozen or more tribes, and managed to make good friends with them. The volume before us contains his diary and adventures, and a good deal of information that will be useful to future travellers, and is very amusing to us sit-at-home travellers. The tribes he visited differ a good deal, but they are by no means so hopeless a race as some have depicted them. Many had never before seen a white man. When Mr. Stone had got about twenty-five miles inland, he fell in with a tribe, whose chief was called Koawagira.

I shall never forget (he says) with what glee he smacked his naked body with his right hand, as he saw his black face reflected in a looking-glass for the first time in his life. It was a most comical scene to witness. This peculiar bodily movement is a sign of joy, and an expressive one when accompanied by an exclamation or a burst of laughter. The glass was handed round to the others, who followed his example. Those who had been watching our movements from a distance, now began to cluster round us to see what was taking place, and to look at our white skins, which they seemed to think were black ones whitened over. On tucking up our trousers, and opening our shirts, to convince them we were not painted, a noise arose, resembling the sound of distant artillery. It was the outburst of their joy and admiration, indicated in the peculiar fashion above described (p. 160).

The natives appear all to be "total abstainers,"—they make no intoxicating drink, and would not touch claret, which they said was "like blood." "Tinned meats they imagined were human, and seemed disgusted at our eating them." But they are fond of biscuit, and have a perfect passion for tobacco. Mr. Stone has brought together a good deal of information that is new. He is also a good draughtsman, and his volume is full of excellent sketches from Nature, some exceedingly good and characteristic. The appendix contains matter to interest the student of languages—a long list of words in the Motu tongue, and a comparison of words in the dialects used by nine tribes; it also contains a list of the 116 species of birds which Mr. Stone collected between October and February; a collection that "has not been out-done in interest," says Mr. Bowdler Sharpe, of the British Museum, "by any collection made in New Guinea."

---

*Up the Amazon and Madeira Rivers through Bolivia and Peru.* By EDWARD D. MATHEWS. London: Sampson Low, 1879.

THOSE who take an interest in the opening out to commerce of Bolivia and the centre of South America by means of the navigation of the Amazon and Madeira rivers, and a railroad by the side of the rapids to Cochabamba, should read Mr. Mathews's pleasant book on the subject. The greater part of the volume is taken up with the author's journal as he travelled up these great rivers, and some part of it may, perhaps, be skipped over without very much loss to the general reader. Still, it portrays the life and its dangers, and gives



a fair idea of the country and its inhabitants. Among the many nuisances on the river are the flies. One species of these stings you, and after a few weeks, within a kind of boil which follows upon the sting, there is formed a maggot one and a half or two inches in size.

We must forgive Mr. Mathews if he is not always quite fair to the Catholic Church, for he seems to know nothing of the way in which she has been enslaved in many of the South American States, and deprived of her liberty of action. He gives, however, a few valuable proofs, and all the more valuable from their being given incidentally, of the action of the Church upon the native Indians.

I have seen (he says) many excellent writers among them (the Indians). All of those who had done service in the churches as sacristans and choristers are able to write; they also can read music, for which they use the ordinary five-line system. There are small schools in all the principal Indian villages, in which reading, writing, and Catholic prayers are taught in the Castilian tongue; and I was rather surprised to see the amount of rudimentary knowledge that is drilled into the Indians, who, as a race, are not at all deficient in natural intellect, being, I believe, of a much higher grade than the Brazilian negroes of African descent (p. 127).

In last century, 1749, there were 26,000 Indians in the fifteen missions in the Madeira Valley, but the total population there now has dwindled down to 8000.

Any one wishing to obtain a general idea of the state of society, so far as the ordinary Protestant Englishman comes in contact with it in Bolivia, should read this book. He will also get a very good notion of the immense riches of Bolivia, and of the importance of opening out the country to commerce. At present the commerce is carried on with the ports on the Pacific, at a great cost, across the barren Andes. The south-eastern side is bounded by the cheerless swamp called the Gran Chaco, so that this is still less a natural outlet for commerce. On the north-east is the Madeira and the Amazon route—and here also are the great agricultural riches of the country in the plains and slopes bending eastward—and this is the future route for commerce with Europe. The population of Bolivia is put down at 2,750,000.

Mr. Mathews, having ascended the Amazon and Madeira rivers, came home by Peru. His book, without being at all first-rate, will quite repay reading. It is printed in large type, and has many good illustrations and an excellent map.

*Sporting Adventures in the Far West.* By JOHN MORTIMER MURPHY.  
London: Sampson Low & Co. 1879.

MR. MURPHY gives us in this volume an account of seven years which he spent wandering and hunting in the Far West. There are several good passages in the work, but the effect of the whole is not pleasing. Mr. Murphy expresses himself in a clumsy way, and also indulges in repetition. At p. 16 he writes that explosive bullets or shells, as at present made,

Cannot always be relied upon to explode when wanted, and they are

sometimes rather dangerous to the carrier. When well made, however, and not so sensitive as to explode on merely touching the animal, they are not only comparatively safe, but the most merciful and effective missiles known for killing heavy game, as they destroy them at once. Yet I would not recommend them.

This is useful information, but is it necessary to repeat it at p. 28 in the following words?—

Shells are also good; but they are dangerous to handle, and are, in too many cases, ineffective, as they explode when they touch the body; and even if they enter one cannot be sure of their bursting. They are, besides, difficult to procure, and are in my estimation almost as dangerous to the hunter as to the hunted.

Some of the sporting adventures, however, are both striking and interesting. The author's hints to sportsmen are very sensible, and his account of the modes of hunting the bear, cougar, wolf, buffalo, moose, wapiti, deer, goat, antelope, and other Western mammals deserves praise. Notwithstanding the spread of population in the country over which Mr. Murphy wandered, and in spite of the ravages of sportsmen and others, game still abounds, and, in some places, in very large numbers. Though we have been made familiar from other sources with the habits of most of the larger animals which roam in the forests and prairies of the Far West, still Mr. Murphy has been able to add something fresh to our knowledge. It may also be added that the book is written in a pleasant vein; and that some of the stories, even as told in the author's own careless English, are well worth reading and remembering.

---

*The Australian Abroad.* By JAMES HINGSTON. London: Sampson Low. 1879.

IN this volume we have an account of a journey from California to New Zealand, made by the author during his vacation. The chief places of interest, *en route*, in Japan, China, Sumatra, Java, and Australia, are visited in turn and described with some minuteness and detail. The account is both interesting and pleasing, and though naturally somewhat superficial, gives one a very fair idea of how much may be seen by any enterprising traveller, even without notably diverging from the beaten track, and of the singular diversity of scene, climate and race to be met with, within comparatively narrow limits. The towns and villages, bays and harbours, the picturesque costumes and strange habiliments of the various peoples, together with their peculiarities and eccentricities, are painted with great freshness and dexterity, and the narrative generally is enlivened by a vein of humour, which now and then, however, bubbles over in somewhat feeble jokes. The author's opinions of men and manners are freely expressed, and without much indication of bias. The following may serve as a specimen of his style, his humour, and his hardly commendable impartiality. The Japanese is the subject of the paragraph:—

His religion is like his eating and drinking and smoking, a mild and cheerful thing. He stops at a temple and washes his hands at a small tank in front. He then ascends the steps, prostrates himself for four minutes, mutters a formula of prayer, and advances to a wooden trough in front of the image of his deity. Into this trough he drops two or three coins of value that go 200 to an English shilling. That done he pulls a rope that rings a bell, and calls the attention of the gods to his donation. The service is now ended. The lavation, the prostration, and the donation have taken six minutes only. He goes away light-hearted and happy. No Scotchman who has stood or sat through a sermon of an hour long could be happier. He that keeps the keys of all the creeds can alone say what form of worship, of all the thousand forms extant, is the right one. I will not judge, that I may not be judged.

Mr. Hingston admires and appreciates many things in the course of his travels; but his warmest admiration seems to be reserved for New Zealand and its people. He even utters the wish that his own mother had been a Maori!

We should have been good-looking to begin with. Our hair had been glossy, curly, dark; and as for quantity, saleable every two months or so, for chignons and back hair. . . . We should never have caught cold, never wanted our head wrapped up, or our throat swathed in bandages, nor hot water to our feet, and tallow to our nose at night. A chemist's shop would have been a curiosity to us, and the doctor but a dim imagination. We ne'er had wanted ear-trumpets, spectacles, or wigs.

For further particulars we must refer the inquirer to the book itself, which may be procured for fourteen shillings, well printed, copiously illustrated, and bound in a neat cloth cover. Two additional volumes are yet to be published, in which the author proposes to escort us on our imaginary journey round the remainder of the earth's circuit.

*Modern Chromatics with applications to Art and Industry.* By OGDEN N. ROOD, Professor of Physics in Columbia College. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

THE power to perceive colour "is not one of the indispensable endowments of our race; deprived of its possession, we should be able not only to exist, but even to attain a high state of intellectual and æsthetic cultivation. Eyes gifted merely with a sense for light and shade would answer quite well for most practical purposes, and they would still reveal to us in the material universe an amount of beauty far transcending our capacity for reception. 'But over and above this we have received yet one more gift, something not quite necessary, a benediction, as it were, in our sense for and enjoyment of colour.'"

The concern of the present volume is with this benediction of colour that elevates nature above the cold monotony of a photograph—not with it as an enjoyable thing, but with the science underlying our spontaneous and artistic appreciation of it. The object of the author has been, he says, to present the "fundamental facts connected with our perception of colour, so far as they are at present known, or con-

cern the general or artistic reader." The volume has two especial titles to notice: it is "modern;" that is to say, it is founded on the most recently accepted, the "undulatory" theory of light, and it is a complete treatise on its special subject, with constant reference to painting, by a man who, besides his high scientific attainments, is himself an amateur artist, and familiar with the work and the difficulties of artists and designers. It ought to prove a very attractive and useful book to these latter, but will be read with interest by non-professional readers. It contains a brief explanation of the nature of light, and then dwells on the various ways in which colour is produced; on colour blindness, on the mixture, contrast, combination, &c., of colours, and concludes with a chapter on painting and decoration. The treatment of the above subjects is sufficiently scientific in form, but avoids technicalities as far as possible. The book is a most pleasant one to read; the style is clear, and the ability of the author to express abstract truths in terse and happy phraseology as conspicuous as his familiarity with the pure science of his subject. The more important statements are further illustrated by numerous diagrams: the greater portion of these are of coloured discs and various instruments of extremely simple construction, and by means of copies of them the student may practically test or illustrate the assertions of the author.

We think the author may most justly indulge in his anticipation that what he says of the æsthetic side of his subject—the science underlying the artist's use of colour—will "prevent ordinary persons, critics, and even painters, from talking and writing about colour in a loose, inaccurate, and not always rational manner." Much of his information will be practically useful to them, as, for example, the results of his experiments as to how far various pigments are injured by the action of light and air. It is interesting, too, to read his demolition of the theory, "almost universally believed by artists," that there are three fundamental kinds of *light*—red, yellow, and blue. But this is less practical, as it still remains true that various mixtures of red, yellow, and blue *paint* will produce other colours and shades needed for a picture. The colour of pigments is not so pure as that of light: a mixture of blue and yellow *light* produces a white, not a green, light. Brewster, therefore, who held this "fundamental" theory, must have been misled by employing an impure spectrum, or one not entirely free from white light. Then, further, if the wave theory of light be accepted, the impossibility of one colour being more fundamental than another is easily deduced from it. When the light vibrations impinge on the retina in waves of  $\frac{1}{39000}$  of an inch in length, they produce the sensation of red: when the waves are  $\frac{1}{41000}$  of an inch in length, they produce orange, and according as they are still further shortened, green or blue, or purple. Thus all variety of colour signifies merely a difference in the length of the waves by which its sensation is produced; or rather *chiefly* a difference in length; for there are other subtle causes supposed to operate therein, as, for example, the triple set of nerve fibres in each minute portion of the retina. The most recent experiments and opinions regarding this

interesting action of the retinal nerves are here clearly laid before the reader.

We quote the following from the author's expression of opinion as to the analogy between chromatics and music :

Attempts have been made from time to time to build up theories of colour based on analogies drawn from sound. The sensation of sound, however, is more particularly connected with time, that of sight with space; and these facts necessitate a fundamental difference in the organs devoted to the reception of sound-waves and of light-waves; and, on account of this difference between the eye and the ear, all such musical theories are quite worthless (p. 304).

---

*History of Ancient Geography among the Greeks and Romans from the Earliest Times till the Fall of the Roman Empire.* By E. H. BUNBURY, F.R.G.S. Two vols. London: J. Murray. 1879.

THIS valuable and learned book will be welcomed by English classical scholars as supplying a want in our literature. It is a work of very great erudition, and its criticisms are those of matured scholarship: we may add, too, that it is as far removed as can be from the dry-as-dust style in which classical erudition too frequently has expressed itself. It is, on the contrary, written in an agreeable style, clear and animated, which flows easily through the rocks and aridities of the most ancient Greek and Latin geographical lore, without strain on the attention or offence to purely English tastes. The more technical quotations and discussions are dealt with fully and learnedly in notes: doubtless many scholars will look upon these as the very plums of the pie.

The work is not a treatise on ancient geography—it can scarcely be said that there was a want of such, whether elementary or advanced; it is what its title professes, a history. Incidentally, much ancient geography is necessarily to be found in it, but its object is to present a “historical review” of ancient geography; to trace its gradual growth from the dim beginnings of pre-historic legends to the scientific developments of the Alexandrian geographers; to discuss critically the worth and character of the verbal maps, if we may say so, left in the writings of those older authors; to ascertain the nature of their geographical ideas and of their information, actual or acquired. To render a treatise of this nature authoritative and sufficient for the needs of the highest scholarship, the author, it is apparent, must join to a complete familiarity with the ancient writers in their original works, an acquaintance with all the results of modern travel, and critical classical study both of authorities and localities; for, as Mr. Bunbury remarks, “there is scarcely a disputed question in ancient geography upon which additional light has not been thrown by local researches and investigations within the last fifty years.” The author evidences at every step his thorough qualification by his easy and effective use of this double-sided knowledge. It guides him through bewildering masses of detail, and gives firmness to his judgment between the conflicting evidence of commentators and specialists. The author appears to have arrived at his own judgments on all the many vexed questions of

ancient geography by processes of investigation and deep thought, and with little bias from the external weight of authorities, however venerable and awe inspiring. He will not help to perpetuate an interpretation or appropriation because of the array of continuous authority supporting it: dissents from Greek and Latin sages when these show signs of being unduly prejudiced in favour of a favourite older author, and loses no time in striving to square a description with a known place, if it is plain enough that the author was describing no actual locality. This trait of independent judgment, based, however, on sound learning, and guided by strong common sense, is a most pleasing characteristic of Mr. Bunbury's book.

The ability and learning of this exhaustive work will quickly secure for it a position and authority of the highest character; it will become the necessary companion of a scholarly reading of the classical authors, and a ready means of ascertaining the extent of their own knowledge of the world in which they lived.

---

*Eight Months in an Ox-Wagon.* By E. F. SANDEMANN. London: Griffith and Farran. 1880.

THESE reminiscences of Boer life are very entertaining, and will gratify lawful curiosity as to the scenery and the roads, the game and the climate, of the Transvaal and the Free State, and the manners and customs of the Boers and Kafirs found within their borders. The travelling by wagon has the incidents, the joys and the discomforts which are inseparable from weather, flood, and beasts. There are a few dangerous and exciting adventures—a lioness now, and a boa-constrictor again, making their appearance to vary the monotony of shooting, eating, and "trekking." Here is a story of a lion and bök fight, which is as new as anything in the work:—

A swart-vitpense (Harris bök, or sable antelope) lay crouched up in a heap, with what he recognised as its young one folded in a close embrace between its fore-legs; its horns were thrown back, and protecting its haunches. On either side of it stood a full-grown male lion, furiously enraged, its mane almost erect, and foaming at the mouth with impatient wrath. As either one or the other crouched down to spring, the bök inclined its head so that the long, deadly horns must transfix the lion in its fall. If one of them moved round in front, the bök veered its neck in the same direction, but always contriving to keep a look-out on the other at the same time, and on the first sign of a spring lowering its horns, but having them up again before the other dared to make an attack. For ten minutes the same positions were maintained, neither of the lions being willing to transfix himself for the other's benefit. At length the pair seemed to recognise that one must be wounded if they meant to kill the bök at all, for both crouched down ready to spring at once, one on each side. The antelope remained motionless, with its horns almost straight up in the air. Both the lions moved a few feet further, and then crouched down again, as if collecting all their strength for a spring, and then, at the same instant, they launched themselves on their prey. For a few seconds all was one confused struggling heap, from which proceeded such fearful roars and agonizing moans as in the course of all his experience the hunter had never heard before. At last, with a convulsive struggle the bök rolled half over on its back, and from between its legs



the young one darted out, apparently unhurt, and disappeared in the bush. To the hunter's intense amazement he then perceived that the lion which had been nearest to him was transfixed on the bök's horn, which, entering between the fore-legs, protruded just to one side of the back-bone. The other lion lay alongside roaring horribly, but not attempting to touch the bök, which was evidently at its last gasp. (P. 255.)

The hunter approached, and shot the surviving lion. Mr. Sandemann does not profess to have seen this heroic fight himself, but he vouches for the accuracy of the story.

---

*Cetshwayo's Dutchman; being the Private Journal of a White Trader in Zululand during the British Invasion.* By CORNELIUS VIJN. Translated from the Dutch, and edited, with Preface and Notes, by the Right Rev. J. W. COLENZO, Bishop of Natal. London: Longmans & Co. 1880.

THE interest of this little volume—and it is of very great interest—lies chiefly in Bishop Colenso's commentary and notes. It is well known that Dr. Colenso has very strong views about the late Zulu war. He has all along pronounced it to be an unjustifiable and cruel aggression on a noble-minded king and an offending people. He has now had an opportunity of putting before the public at length, not only his views, but a great deal of the materials on which his views have been formed. Mr. Cornelius Vijn is a young Dutchman—he is not more than twenty-three—who started on a trading tour in Zululand in the autumn of 1878, was detained by the Zulus about January 1, 1879, and was an eye-witness of many of the events in the war, especially of the battle of Ulundi and of the greater part of the pursuit of the king. It is not, however, for any fine descriptions of battle or march, or for any new ideas on the politics of South Africa, that the reader will find his journal valuable and interesting. It is poor in literary style, but simple, and seemingly trustworthy. The trader himself is not, by his own showing, a magnanimous man, though brave, cool, and shrewd; but his pages throw a vivid light on the character of Cetshwayo himself, and on the proceedings connected with the abortive negotiations for peace which took place between Lord Chelmsford and the Zulu king before the battle of Ulundi. It was Vijn who was sent for to interpret Lord Chelmsford's letter of June 4, 1879, and who had to write, in very indifferent English, three letters from Cetshwayo to the English general, two of which at least must now be in possession of the War Office. It was Vijn also, who after Ulundi came off to Sir Garnet Wolseley, by the king's own wish, with the message that the king had no longer an army, and was ready to submit. But the English leader wanted to get hold of the Zulu king, and at once offered the Dutchman 250*l.* if he would bring him in two days. Vijn rode back to Cetshwayo and did his best to persuade him to go with him to the English head-quarters, but to no purpose. The king "was afraid;" he could not depend on the English; they "played crafty tricks." Accordingly, the envoy returned to the camp at Ulundi, and Sir Garnet Wolseley at once sent him

back, with 500 cavalry, under Major Barrow, to take Cetshwayo by force. The sequel is known; Vijn got 10*l.* for his work—though he was not present at the actual capture—and on representing that it was too little, he afterwards received 40*l.* more, and the office of interpreter at 1*l.* a day. It is this narrative which Bishop Colenso has translated, and used as a text for some exceedingly strong comments. The following extracts from the preface will show the spirit in which the “Notes” are written :

It has been terrible to see this great wave of wickedness rolling on, and to be powerless to help it, to be debarred all possibility of showing the injustice of the war, until it was too late—too late to prevent the shedding of innocent blood and the ravaging of a whole country—too late to save the lives of 2000 of our own soldiers and natives, and of 10,000 patriotic Zulus—too late to prevent the name of Englishman from becoming in the native mind the synonym for duplicity, treachery, and violence, instead of, as in days gone by, for truth, and justice, and righteousness.

And again :

I sympathise, in short, entirely with the words of a friend, who with full knowledge of the facts states his conviction that “the Zulu war, discreditable to our arms, disgraceful to our civilization, and injurious to our good name and to the discipline of our army, was not necessary, and therefore was without just cause”—who is “disgusted to hear (so calling themselves) Christians speak of cruel murders as if they were the finest feats of arms,” and who mournfully adds, “it makes one despair of ultimate good, to see such a saturnalia of wrong-doing and such an apotheosis of force in this lower world.”

#### BOOKS ON HOLY SCRIPTURE.

*Das Hohelied Salomo's bei den Jüdischen Erklärern des Mittelalters; nebst einem Anhange: Erklärung'sproben aus Handschriften.* Von DR. SIEGMUND SALFELD. Berlin: Julius Benzian. 1879. (*The Canticles of Solomon, as treated by the Jewish Commentators of the Middle Ages; with an Appendix containing Specimens of their Exposition from MSS.* By Dr. SIGISMUND SALFELD. Berlin: Julius Benzian. 1879.)

THIS little book is the fruit of long and patient labour, and in reality it contains more than is indicated by the title. It notices briefly the Septuagint translation and the Targum or Chaldee paraphrase known as the Targum of the Canticles: it collects traces of the views prevalent regarding the Canticles from the older Midrashim and from the Talmud. Then, beginning with the earliest Jewish commentators, it gives a summary of the way in which some forty Jewish doctors interpreted the Song of Songs. Our readers may form some conception of the labour which such a work implies, when we add that, of the authorities quoted, about twenty exist only in manuscript. It is true the author has not toiled alone. Other scholars, among them the Abbé Perreau at Parma and Dr. Neubauer at Oxford, have given him valuable assistance.

What is the use, the reader may ask, of such labour? Manifestly

it is labour which one man has to undertake for the sake of others; for the number of those who can toil through the Rabbinical commentators for themselves must be, and indeed ought to be, small. Yet we believe Dr. Salfeld's results are full of interest even for a wide circle, and that for the two following reasons:—

First of all, the interpretation of the Canticles is a matter of theological importance, in the strictest sense of the word. Here is a book which looks at first sight like an Oriental love poem, and as such it is the fashion among a large school of Protestant scholars to expound it. They do not deny its extreme beauty or even the moral spirit in which it is written. But a Catholic is obliged to regard it as the work of the Holy Ghost; he is, as a necessary consequence, obliged to hold that the love of which it speaks has a mystical sense. And he naturally inquires, had the Jews any fixed idea as to its import? Has the Synagogue any settled tradition on the subject, and does it agree with that of the Church? The answer is "Yes," and Dr. Salfeld proves it. He thinks (and we believe rightly) that even the Septuagint translation, mere translation as it is, makes it at least probable that the translator interpreted the Canticles allegorically (see *Canticles* iv. 8 and vi. 3 in the LXX.). It is undoubted that the Chaldee paraphrase which, although in its present form it dates only from the seventh century, contains older elements, follows the same allegorical exegesis. And we know that from very early times the book of Canticles was read in the Synagogue, at the Pasch, and applied mystically to the redemption of Israel. All the Rabbinical doctors witness to the constancy of the Jewish tradition on this point. Even the Karaites, with their hatred of the Talmudical and Rabbinical doctrines, and their preference for the literal sense of Scripture, attribute an allegorical meaning to the Canticles. There is barely a trace of another interpretation, and no trace at all of a counter-tradition. Moreover, the special way in which an allegorical interpretation was given tells for the Catholic view. Putting aside some Peripatetic, Jewish scholars, who found the doctrine of Aristotle on the soul in the Song of Solomon, the Rabbins refer the love of which Solomon speaks to that which exists between God and His people, or, again, between the Messias and His people. Dr. Salfeld has made all this more certain than it was before, because his investigations have been much wider than those of his predecessors, and also because he vindicates the famous Ibn Esra from the charge of rationalism with regard to the Canticles often made against him. Of course the weight of Jewish tradition becomes much greater when we reflect how often the prophets use human love as an image of God's love for His Church. The allegorical or typical interpretation is natural *a priori*, and the tradition of the Synagogue helps to clench the matter.

From a philological point of view, the opinions of the Rabbinical writers on the Canticles have a singular interest. Even the reader, who is ignorant of the original, can see how many words hard of interpretation occur in this little book of Scripture. There are names of flowers, of spices, of ornaments for the person, of furniture, some of which do not occur elsewhere, and all of which have an uncertain meaning.

After the ancient versions, Jewish tradition on these words give us the best help we can get. Dr. Salfeld has shown great skill in making selections on such matters.

There is a third difficulty about the Canticles, on which we had hoped to get some light, and on which we have been disappointed, though that is no fault of Dr. Salfeld's. Origen speaks of this divine poem as written "in modum dramatis," and this is evidently the case. It is more like a drama than anything else in Biblical literature: there is, indeed, only one other portion of the Hebrew Bible (the last two chapters of Micah) which has a dramatic character at all. But it is a drama in which for the most part the names of the speakers are not given, and students of the original know that every recent commentator has had a way of his own for dividing the speeches and fixing the changes of scene. But here we can learn nothing from the Rabbinical expositors.

---

*Judas Maccabæus and the Jewish War of Independence.* By CLAUDE REIGNIER CONDER, R.E. London: Marcus Ward. 1879.

WE have scarcely anything but praise for one half of this book, the half which treats of the subject given on the title-page. We need scarcely tell our readers that Mr. Conder is a first-rate authority on the topography of the Holy Land, and he tells us that he has been able to visit more than once each of the battle-fields of Judas. But Mr. Conder is much more than a mere topographer. He throws himself with an intelligent enthusiasm into his subject. He appreciates the unselfish greatness of Judas—the romantic daring which marked the beginning of the Jewish revolt, the consummate ability with which Judas selected his positions and won his victories against overwhelming odds, and then his tragic death which closed his heroic struggle for independence with apparent defeat, and kept him from seeing the glorious results which his ability, his prudence, his piety, no less than his dauntless courage had secured for his nation. The battles live in Mr. Conder's pages. Nothing can be more happy than the descriptions of the battle-grounds, or than the illustrations from later history, particularly from the history of the Holy Land. We only regret that even this part of the book is disfigured here and there by careless writing and even by gross inaccuracy. What can Mr. Conder mean by telling us, p. 142, that "Jesus the Son of Josadek" "came back with Esra?" Surely everybody who has read the Old Testament is aware that Jesus the Son of Josadek returned with Zorobabel (1 Esdras v. 2), while Esra did not go to Jerusalem till the reign of Artaxerxes, nearly a century later.

But it is with the portion of the book which has really little connection with the wars of Judas Maccabæus that we have serious fault to find. Mr. Conder gives an account of Jewish religion, polity and civilisation generally. It is written in the flowing style of those popular manuals which have come so much into vogue of late. It is eminently readable, and even in a degree instructive. But like most manuals of this sort it gives scarcely any reference to the

original sources. As a natural consequence we meet with a number of views stated briefly and in dogmatic language, which the author gives us no means of testing. This is provoking to the wary and misleading to the unwary reader, who is charmed to learn so much with such little pains. Nothing, for example, can be more unsatisfactory than Mr. Conder's account of the Messianic expectation among the later Jews. And when he tells us that the book of Wisdom teaches "the pre-existence of souls, the formation of the world from formless matter, the existence of a soul of the universe," he ought to give references in the first place and let his readers know in the second place that other interpretations are maintained. Further, when he goes on to say that this book contains no "distinct teaching as to the immortality of the soul," he contradicts himself. For in the same paragraph, he adds, "the righteous are promised eternal life:" which is distinct, although, of course, not full teaching on this head.

On one minor point we wish that Mr. Conder had done more to satisfy our curiosity. After stating what everybody knows that after the exile Aramaic or Chaldee replaced the old Hebrew, he asserts that this Chaldee "remains even now with but slight modification the language of the Fellahin in Palestine." Is this really so? We are aware that a very debased Syriac is spoken by the Christians and Jews of Mesopotamia and Kurdistan. But in the usual Chaldee grammars (*e.g.*, in that of Winer and the recent Chaldee manual of Turpie), the Chaldee is said to have died out as a spoken language after the early Arabian conquests. It seems incredible that the peasants of Palestine still speak Chaldee, with but slight modification. But we should be very grateful for fuller information.

---

*Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten.* Nebst einer kritischen Textausgabe von des letzteren *Instituta regularia divinæ legis.* Von Dr. H. Kihn. Freiburg. 1880. (*Theodore of Mopsuestia and Junilius Africanus as Interpreters of Scripture.* By Dr. H. Kihn. Friburg. 1880.)

THE study of theology, and especially of the Scriptures, was in the first centuries chiefly encouraged and developed by two great schools of interpreters, the one known as the school of Alexandria, the other as that of Antioch. Pantaenus, Clement, and Origen are prominent names in the first, while Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, S. John Chrysostom, and others, have secured immortal fame for the second. Never in the history of the Church have there appeared such interpreters of Holy Writ, men who seem to have rested, like S. John, on the breast of Christ Himself, and to have imbibed, as it were, a part of His own virginal, holy spirit. They have the eagle view, the majestic depth of S. John, and their keen understanding of the divine word has never since been attained in spite of all the learning of our days. But it is also true that they did not always avoid the danger of going too exclusively or too far into either the allegorical-mystical or historical-grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures. This is clearly shown by the examples of Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Kihn's book is divided into three parts. The first treats on Theodore of Mopsuestia, the second on Junilius Africanus, and his compendium of the introduction to the Bible; the third contains a comparison of the Biblical theology of Junilius with that of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Our author gives us a very full and instructive account of Theodore, "the precursor of modern criticism," of his canon, his notions of inspiration, his hermeneutics, his anthropology and Christology. Theodore's boldness and presumption as an interpreter, his want of respect for the authority of others, especially of the Fathers, his wrong notions on several most important points of Christian doctrine—viz., his denial of original sin and his imputing, like Nestorius, two persons to Christ—are facts but too well established. As an interpreter of Holy Scripture, he made exclusive use of Greek translations, and especially of the Septuagint, which he considered to be a faultless and infallible version. Kihn (p. 44) calls him "a man of great talent, of great zeal for knowledge, and of universal learning, but no great thinker. He had not the qualities which distinguished his friend S. John Chrysostom—viz., piety and peace of mind, unwavering faith, and immovable firmness of character. His cholerick disposition made him rash and precipitate. He took up hastily first one thing, then another; but his ardour soon abated." His theological errors are attributed by our author (p. 52) more to inconsiderateness and haste than to malice and bad intention. However, the Nestorians certainly held him as their great doctor, and as the interpreter of Scripture, whose authority they believed to be infallible (p. 334 sq.). Kihn gives a most interesting account of the famous Nestorian school at Nisibis, in Persia, and the plan of studies carried out there. At Nisibis, as well as at all the other Nestorian schools, Theodore's influence was predominant (pp. 198-212).

It has been generally said and accepted that Junilius Africanus was an African bishop, and that he was the writer of a book entitled, "Of the Parts of the Divine Law." This opinion is now proved to be wrong. Kihn has been the first to establish, by his elaborate researches and sagacious criticism, that Junilius was a layman, born in Africa. He translated and arranged the book at Constantinople, at a time when he held one of the highest and most influential offices of State. The argument is chiefly based on the following reasons:—The nine best manuscripts out of thirteen which contain the book of Junilius do not give him the title of bishop; nor is there any other positive argument in favour of his having held that dignity. That he was a layman is shown by the preface of his own work, and that he was a lawyer and in a very high position, by the fact that Fulgentius Ferrandus, a deacon of Carthage, addressed him, in a letter of recommendation, "Truly illustrious, &c. son of the Holy Mother the Catholic Church" (see the letter, in A. Reifferscheid, "Anecdota Casinensia," Wratisl., 1871). The last argument would seem more erudite than convincing. But the author was fortunate in finding the name of "Junilos, a man of African origin," mentioned in the anecdotes of Procopius (a writer of the sixth century), as occupying the position of "*quæstor sacri palatii*," the successor of the famous Trebonianus. Kihn thinks that he had charge



of this office from A.D. 545 to A.D. 552, and translated his book from the Greek into the Latin in the year 551. The author of the book was Paulus, afterwards Metropolitan of Nisibis, where it was used in the school as a class-book for the introduction to the study of the Scriptures. The proper title of the book, known as "Of the Parts of the Divine Law," is "Instituta regularia divinæ legis"—Rules for an introduction to the Divine Law. Junilius himself uses this title, which is also given to the book by the greater number, and the best, of the manuscripts. All this is contained in the second part of Kihn's work.

In the third part, he has not only proved the great influence which the Aristotelian philosophy had on the book, but also shown that it is founded on the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The similarity between Theodore's views and those of Junilius is most striking, especially in regard to the canon and the inspiration of the Scriptures. Junilius, lib. I. 7, distinguishes three classes of books, books of perfect authority, of medium, and of no authority. Baruch and Ecclesiasticus belong to the first, the other deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament as well as the two Books of Chronicles, Job, Esdras, Esther, the Canticle of Canticles to the second class. So also do the Second Epistle of S. Peter, the Second and Third Epistles of S. John, those of S. James and S. Jude, and the Revelation of S. John. This extraordinary canon was not that of an African bishop, nor of a Latin author at all, but it was the canon of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodore had distinguished between books written with the gift of prophecy and books written merely with the gift of wisdom. This distinction, says Kihn (p. 79), was constantly used by the Jews themselves. He also thinks that Theodore's canon agrees perfectly with the yet unascertained canon of Flavius Josephus. But the arguments given by our author in favour of his opinion do not seem to be sufficiently convincing.

The critical edition of the text of Junilius (pp. 465-528) is based on the use and comparison of the thirteen manuscripts, the best of which is in the "Codex rescriptus S. Galli, 908," and belongs to the later half of the sixth century. Professor Kihn's edition of Junilius's work, as well as his historical and exegetical explanation, deserves the greatest praise. No one will be able in future to speak of that work without consulting Kihn's book, either directly or indirectly. It is full of interesting and instructive matter, especially in regard to the canon, inspiration, and hermeneutics of the Sacred Scriptures.

---

*Polychronius, Bruder Theodor's von Mopsuestia und Bischof von Apamea. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Exegese. Von Dr. OTTO BARDENHEWER. Freiburg. 1879. (Polychronius, brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Bishop of Apamea. A Study on the History of Exegesis. By Dr. OTTO BARDENHEWER. Friburg. 1879.)*

**D**R. BARDENHEWER, a young professor of the University of Munich, draws attention to one of the greatest ornaments of the school of Antioch. His book contains an account of the life and works

of Polychronius, his views on canon and inspiration, and his hermeneutic principles, to which is added a translation and explanation of some portions of his commentaries.

Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus,\* praises Polychronius as a successful ruler of his diocese of Apamea, and as a man of graceful eloquence and virtuous life. This is about all that is known of his life with any degree of certainty. According to Cardinal Mai,† Polychronius seems to have written commentaries on almost the whole of the Old Testament. There are, however, only fragments of them preserved, and these chiefly belong to his commentaries on Job, Daniel, and Ezechiel.

Polychronius (says Dr. Bardenhewer, p. 5) has happily avoided the extravagances of his brother Theodore, though not quite all his faults. In real exegetical accuracy and conscientiousness he has surpassed all Antiochean interpreters; in knowledge of history and languages not one amongst them was equal to him, nor has any one entered with such love and keen understanding into the depth of the Biblical text, nor made such correct allowances for actual circumstances.

Of all his works, the best preserved are his very valuable scholia on the book of Daniel (published by Mai, l. c. P. ii. pp. 105-160). It is strange that he, like S. Ephrem, explains Daniel's prophecy of the four empires to mean, besides the Babylonian, Median, and Persian, the Macedonian (and not the Roman) empire. But he believed in the canonicity of all the deuterocanonical pieces of Daniel, perhaps with the exception of the Hymn of the Three Children in the fiery furnace. Bardenhewer gives us (pp. 63-65) some arguments for his opinion that Polychronius really denied the canonicity of Dan. iii. 25-30, Vulg. They rest on the passage: "This hymn is not found in the Hebrew and Syriac text. It is said to have been afterwards added by some one, and founded upon what is narrated in the book. I shall, therefore, abstain from explaining this part, in order to keep exclusively to the interpretation of the book." Granted, that Polychronius has written these words; but they only mention the doubts of others as a reason why Polychronius did not interpret the hymn.

It is clear from Dr. Bardenhewer's book that Polychronius is worthy of the greatest consideration. Dr. Bardenhewer is well able to appreciate him, and shows a well-trained judgment in handling critical questions, and a great taste for patristic and exegetical studies.

May the author continue to encourage, and to facilitate the study of the Fathers, and the interpretation of the Scriptures, by works similar to the one mentioned here.

---

\* Eccl. Hist., v. 40.

† Scriptorum veterum nova collectio. Tom. I. Romae, 1825, praef. p. xxxi.

*The Holy Bible, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation.* By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by Canon Cook. New Testament. Vol. II. St. John—The Acts of the Apostles. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1880.

THE Speaker's Commentary, like a Bill in Parliament, advances very slowly. It is two years since the first volume of the New Testament appeared, and seventeen since the whole work was first taken in hand. In the meantime Dr. Ellicott's Commentary, a similar, if not superior, work has been begun and completed. Anglicanism is treating the Sacred Scriptures as it has treated the old Catholic Cathedrals. After centuries of neglect and decay, they are now busy under-pinning and buttressing-up the old walls, removing abominations of ugliness, and restoring what remains of ancient beauty. The Speaker's Commentary, like all the works of Anglicanism, is strongly marked with the spirit of compromise. There is a manifest desire to run with the hare of orthodoxy and to hunt with the hounds of "the higher criticism." It contains little devotion and less dogmatic teaching. The dignified pilots of Anglicanism give a wide berth to the rocks of controversy and hug the safer shores of platitude. Still, considering who the writers are, it must be confessed with gratitude that traditional Protestant glosses are abandoned and many candid admissions are made. The special value of the work lies in collecting together the best results of modern scholarship as applied to the defence of the Sacred Scriptures. It is difficult to tell what will be the effect on the mind of the general reader of this vast apparatus of textual criticism, if it is not to show him the folly of the Protestant principle of "the Bible, and Bible only," and make him say, with St. Augustine, that he would not believe the Gospels did not the authority of the Catholic Church compel him.

Canon Westcott's Introductory Treatise and Commentary on St. John's Gospel gives a special value to the present volume. His defence of St. John's authorship of the Fourth Gospel by direct and indirect evidence is very powerful. He considers that "it was written after the other three, in Asia, at the request of the Churches there, as a summary of the oral teaching of St. John upon the life of Christ, to meet a want which had grown up in the Church at the close of the Apostolic age:" that it assumes a knowledge of the other Gospels, which it supplements. In reply to the cavils against the historic character of St. John's Last Discourse of our Lord, he points to the power of a trained memory, disciplined to retain the spoken words of a Master, which make it easy to understand how a sympathetic hearer like St. John would bear them about with him till his experience of the life of the Church illuminated their meaning, when the promised Paraclete "taught him all things," and "brought all things to his remembrance which Christ had spoken." Canon Westcott sets the highest value on the Vatican Codex. A most careful examination, he says, leaves it in possession of the title to "supreme excellence," and he thinks it not unlikely that it represents the text preserved in the original Greek Church of Rome (p. lxxxix). His admission about the

value of the Vulgate is very candid. He quotes its renderings throughout the notes "in the hope of directing more attention to the study of it. "It seems to me," he says, "that we have lost much in every way from our neglect of a version which has influenced the theology of the West more profoundly than we know" (p. xcvi).

His treatment of the first chapter of St. John is very exhaustive, and in setting forth the theology of the Incarnation there is none of the timid reserve which characterises his comments upon the sixth and twentieth chapters. Commenting on our Lord's words to His Blessed Mother (ch. ii., v. 4) he says, "In the original there is not the least tinge of reproof or severity in the term (woman). The address is that of courteous respect—even of tenderness" (p. 36). And in another place he describes St. John as fulfilling his filial "office to the Mother of the Lord in his own home in Galilee to the last, gaining by that a fuller knowledge of the revelation of the Son of God, and bringing into a complete harmony the works which he had seen, and the words which he had heard" (p. xxxv). In ch. vi. 71, he adopts the reading, "Judas, son of Simon the Iscariot," which he holds to be a local name, derived from Kerieth, a town of Juda, and borne by father and son alike. St. John's Last Supper is proved to be identical with that of the Synoptist Gospels; and St. John's "sixth hour" (xix. 14) is harmonized with St. Mark's "third," by showing from other passages that St. John reckons time as we do, and not by the old Jewish method. The least satisfactory part of Canon Westcott's work is his treatment of the disputed passages, v. 3, 4, and viii. 3-12, both of which he rejects as marginal glosses. When "the angel" is driven from the text, he finds little difficulty in explaining the pool of Bethesda as a chalybeate spring! He thinks that the account of the woman taken in adultery is borrowed from Papias. In rejecting these and similar passages from the New Testament, Canon Westcott is mainly influenced by the three great Uncials. If they agree in omitting any passage, their judgment is final and infallible. If this be so, the converse ought surely to hold good—viz., that what these MSS. agree in admitting as Scripture, Canon Westcott ought to admit. And if so, why does he reject the deutero-canonical books of the Old Testament?

Of the Acts of the Apostles we have but little space to speak. Canon Cook's Introduction is a valuable defence of their authenticity and of St. Luke's authorship. The objections of the author of "Supernatural Religion" against the speeches are very well met. Not much can be said of Dr. Jacobson's Commentary on the Acts, except perhaps to call attention to the smallness of such commenting as this on Acts xv. 7:—"St. Peter had not presided at this Council, which he neither convoked nor dismissed. And the advice which he gave was based, not on personal or official authority, but on acknowledged facts. The name of James is placed before those of Cephas and John," Gal. ii. 9 (p. 432).

*A Handbook to the Bible; derived from Ancient Monuments and Modern Exploration.* By F. R. CONDER, and C. R. CONDER, R.E. London: Longmans. 1879.

THIS is certainly a most useful Bible Guide, and if the Palestine Exploration Expedition had brought forth nothing else, it would still deserve the thanks of all Scriptural students. It is a compendium of facts and results, with a good general index, by competent observers. A new Bible chronology is given, based upon Assyrian and Egyptian records, which agrees neither with the short nor the long system. In this system the creation would be B.C. 4810, and the birth of Abraham B.C. 2261. Another point of difference is that the Israelites are left in Egypt four hundred and thirty years. There is also much useful information about the Hebrew Ritual, the Temple services, Hebrew weights, measures, and coins. The second part of the book is merely geographical, and is a summary of the results of the Survey of Palestine, throwing a new light both on sacred history and geography. The site of Bethulia has been identified in the modern village of Mithilia (p. 289). This removes one of the greatest difficulties urged against the historical character of the Book of Judith. The animals and plants of Bible lands are enumerated, and many misconceptions corrected. For instance, the counterparts of the behemoth, leviathan, and unicorn (rim) which figure in the Book of Job are found in the hippopotamus, the crocodile, and the now extinct aurochs, so often sculptured in Assyrian bas-reliefs. The book is furnished with excellent maps and Temple plans.

---

*The Life and Work of St. Paul.* By F. W. FARRAR, D.D. 2 vols. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. 1880.

CANON FARRAR'S special gift lies in his power of popularizing the results of Scripture study, in working up dry material into an interesting form, and in grouping minute details so as to make an attractive picture. Encouraged by his success in the "Life of Christ," he applies the same method to the Life and Epistles of St. Paul. The result is not altogether pleasing, especially to Catholic readers. There is too much of Renan's "ugly little Jew" theory, and too little spirituality. A man who has no higher ideal than a Wesley or Whitfield cannot do justice to St. Paul. To those who are familiar with Cardinal Newman's picture of the great Apostle, Canon Farrar's will appear like caricature; the one is of heaven, heavenly, the other, of the earth, earthly. Howson and Conybeare, and Mr. Lewin had already collected all that archæology or travel could produce to illustrate the travels of the Apostle. To this Canon Farrar has added copious rhetoric and poetical descriptions. Even here, at his strongest, he is not so happy as in his "Life of Christ," because he paints not from Nature, but from second-hand descriptions. It is to be regretted that he could not carry out his intention of visiting Asia Minor and Greece, just as he had previously visited the Holy Land. Whatever new lights are found in his work are brought from Rabbinical sources. Canon Farrar is strong in Talmudical

literature, and builds too much on so treacherous a foundation. For instance, he relies on certain passages of the Mishna to prove, contrary to all Catholic tradition and to St. Paul's own words (1. Cor. vii. 8.), that St. Paul was once married. He adopts the opinion that the thorn in the flesh was a very acute and repulsive form of ophthalmia, and sees evidence of this in the Epistle to the Galatians (iv. 13, vi. 11, 15), and in St. Paul's mistaking the high priest (Acts xxiii. 5). Another strange opinion expressed by Canon Farrar is that, despite St. Paul's express statement to the contrary (Gal. ii. 3), he so far yielded to the Judaizers as to circumcise Titus, who was born of Gentile parents. This, of course, makes St. Paul's subsequent rebuke of St. Peter's far less serious concession very inconsistent. The Epistle to the Hebrews is rejected, as being the work of Apollos. Still there are many good features in Canon Farrar's work. He has no mercy on those who separate St. Paul from St. Peter and the Twelve. He traces the once fashionable notion of Pauline and Petrine opposition to Ebionite slanders. Neither is he afraid to say what he thinks of the old Protestant rubbish about the Pope being the "man of sin" (2 Thess. ii. 3). "Can any sane man," he says, "of competent education seriously argue that it is the Papacy which pre-eminently arrays itself in superiority to, and antagonism against, every one who is called God, or every object of worship?" (p. 616, vol. 1). It is amusing to find that Dr. Wordsworth has taken to heart this assertion on his mental condition, and proved its justice by republishing his forgotten craze about the Pope being Antichrist. In the face of Protestant prejudice it is a mark of courage in Canon Farrar to admit that the Church of Rome "is, by the free acknowledgment of our own formularies, a Church, and a Christian Church, and has been pre-eminently a Mother of Saints, and many of her Popes have been good, and noble, and holy men, and vast benefactors of the world, and splendid maintainers of the Faith of Christ" (vol. i. p. 617, note).

---

## Notices of Books.

---

*The Foregleams of Christianity: an Essay on the Religious History of Antiquity.* By CHARLES NEWTON SCOTT. London: Smith and Elder. 1877.

IT is a great subject which Mr. Scott approaches in this little work. He considers that the "Science of Religion" is already sufficiently advanced to demonstrate

Firstly, that the elements of truth, which lay scattered in the various religions and philosophies anterior to Christianity can only be satisfactorily harmonized in the creed of the Catholic Church. Secondly, that, apart from that creed, the more advanced in tone, the more pure in aspiration have been religions and philosophies, the less consistent were the doctrines of their several metaphysical systems either with facts or with each other. Thirdly, that the hand of God is manifest in the succession



of religious developments, which gradually prepared mankind for the revelation of Christianity in "the fulness of time" (p. 2).

In his book Mr. Scott seeks to collect and bind together within a small compass "admissions of some of the principal latest authorities" in support of these conclusions. The authorities whom Mr. Scott cites are very varied. Mr. Max Müller and Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Carlyle and Mr. Sewell, M. de Laprade and M. Lenormant, M. Beulé and M. Biot, Canon Farrar and Mr. Lewes, Dr. Pusey and Dr. William Smith, Mr. Maurice and Victor Cousin, figure side by side in curious juxtaposition. The author makes discriminating use of the varied sources to which he recurs, but his pages are no mere echoes of other men's thoughts. We do not say that he is strikingly original, but it is clear that he has not only read but reflected. Of the correctness of his main thesis there can be no doubt. The ancient philosophy was, in a real sense, a preparation for Christianity. Tertullian somewhere speaks of a kind of natural Christianity—"testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ," is the phrase he employs: and we know from St. Augustine's Confessions how that great Doctor found in Plato a schoolmaster to lead him to Christ. Our Blessed Lord was "the desire of the Gentiles." The rays of light which radiate from those "wise old spirits who preserved natural reason and religion in the midst of heathen darkness" (as Jeremy Taylor happily describes them) were but the foregleams of the Sun of Justice who was to arise with healing in his wings.

We are cordially at one, then, with Mr. Scott as to the point of view from which his book is written. And therefore we the more regret that his development of his theme has been marred by his imperfect appreciation of the work which Jesus Christ came to do. If anything is clear from the testimony of the Sacred Scriptures and the Holy Fathers it is that Jesus Christ came into the world to found a Church, to establish a Society, to set up a Visible Kingdom, which should last—*Lux Mundi*—until His coming again. If that kingdom has perished, the Divine Word has failed, and our faith is vain. If it has not perished, where is it? We wish Mr. Scott would weigh this question. It lies at the very root of the subject which he discusses in his book. As Cardinal Newman writes:

If all that has remained of it [viz., the visible kingdom which Christ set up] is what can be discerned at Constantinople or Canterbury, I say it has disappeared; and either there was a radical corruption of Christianity from the first, or Christianity came to an end, in proportion as the type of the Nicene Church faded out of the world: for all that we know of Christianity, in ancient history, as a concrete fact, is the Church of Athanasius and his fellows: it is nothing else historically but that bundle of phenomena, that combination of claims, prerogatives, and corresponding acts. . . . There is no help for it; we cannot take as much as we please, and no more, of an institution which has a monadic existence. We must either give up the belief in the Church as a Divine institution altogether, or we must recognise it in that Communion of which the Pope is the head. With him alone and round about him are found the claims, the prerogatives, and duties which we identify with the kingdom set up by Christ. We must take things as they are;

to believe in a Church, is to believe in the Pope.—“Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.” § 3.

To which we may add that to a conscientious and philosophical student of history, as Mr. Scott clearly is, to believe in Christianity, is to believe in a Church. No fact is more certain, as we feel sure he would acknowledge, than that from the first the religion of Jesus Christ was distinctly ecclesiastical, sacerdotal, and hierarchical.

So much we venture to press upon Mr. Scott, in return for the pleasure and instruction we have derived from his pages. As a specimen of them we give the following recapitulation in which he sums up the first half of his volume :—

The Materialist perceives rightly the existence, qualities, and effects of matter; but it is wrong to conclude that nothing exists beyond matter, or no happiness beyond that which matter can afford.

The Fetishist perceives rightly that connected with the phenomena of matter there is something immeasurably greater than himself—the Divine; but is wrong to conclude that the substance of the Divine is not to be sought further than in matter.

The Pantheist perceives rightly that matter is connected with intelligent force, and that the Divine resides more in the latter than in the former; but is wrong to conclude that the connection between Spirit and Matter, or that between God and the World, is fatal or indissoluble, or that *all* life in the World is Divine.

The Polytheist perceives rightly that the manifestations of the Divine in Nature are various; but is wrong to conclude that Deity has not unity of substance or unity of purpose.

The Anthropomorphist perceives rightly that the Divine is more manifested in Man than in any other natural being familiarly known; but is wrong to conclude that the attributes of Deity differ only in degree from his own.

The Dualist perceives rightly that there is something in Man and in the rest of the World totally opposed to Divine Love, Wisdom, and Life; but is wrong to conclude that Evil or its cause is self-existent, or that Good is not more powerful than Evil, and the World or any part of it entirely in the power of Evil.

The Monotheist perceives rightly that all Good is derived from one centre—God; but is wrong to conclude that God exists only in one hypostasis, or that His manifestations are not various.

The Theist perceives rightly that all things but God have been created from nothing by God, and remain subject to his control; but is wrong to conclude that Evil has not acquired a positive existence, or that there is no more intimate link than that of dependence between God and the World.

The Mystic perceives rightly that there is a Life directly proceeding from eternal Love and Wisdom within himself, without being of himself; but is wrong to conclude that he is emancipated from the pressure of the World (the seat of Evil), or that his own nature is not more or less vitiated, and consequently exposing him to delusions of evil spirits or of his own imagination.

The Christian is taught by divinatory revelation, and may be enabled by grace to perceive, that only through the Incarnation and Atonement of the Divine Word can the self-vitiated World be so united to the three Divine Persons of the Trinity that “God may be all in all,” and that, Divine permission of Evil through the free-will of creatures being necessary and solely intended for the complete satisfaction of Divine love, only

the sufferings of incarnate Deity could satisfy and sufficiently manifest Divine love of the World, the seat of Evil, and Divine abhorrence of Evil itself.

Owing, therefore, its three great fundamental doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement to divinatory revelation, Christian Theology can deduce therefrom the elements of a metaphysical system, which will reject the heresies and harmonize the truths of all other systems.

This seems to us to be, on the whole, very well put. It is, in fact, the working out of a thought of Pascal's: "Touts leurs principes sont vrais, des pyrrhoniens, des stoïques, des athées, &c. Mais leurs conclusions sont fausses parce que les principes opposés sont vrais aussi."—"Pensées," chap. xxv. 28.

---

*The Life of St. Thomas of Hereford.* By RICHARD STRANGE, S.J.  
London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

THIS recent volume of the Quarterly Series is a newly-edited reprint of an old work, now very rarely to be met with, entitled "The Life and Gests of St. Thomas Cantilupe, Bishop of Hereford, &c. Collected by R. S., S. I. At Gant. Printed by Robert Walker at the signe of the Annuntiation of our B. Lady, 1674." A facsimile of this title-page is given: the remainder of Father Strange's book is reproduced, but with modernized spelling. The old "Life and Gests," too, is of a devotional rather than of a historical or critical character; and its meagreness of detail has been supplemented by an excellently compiled chapter of additional biographical matter.

We have read this reprint with unusual pleasure, and believe that it only needs to be known to be much esteemed. Whatever may be thought of the want of a more critical work on the Saint and his time, it would certainly have been a great pity if this real gem had been left in its obscurity because of its somewhat old-fashioned setting. These quaintly-built sentences, accumulations of epithet and figure, illustrations from a bygone science, and other tokens of old age do not detract from the influence of a charming book. The author's excellencies are above the mere conceits of style; his writing is full, too, of warm, simple piety, and forms an attractive book of spiritual reading.

Is not the concluding thought in the following passage as beautiful as it is simple?—

While he studied his philosophy at Paris, the window of his closet was a little at fault, and to set it right without trouble or the help of a workman he served himself of a stick or prop of a vine out of the next vineyard. The matter, God wot, so very inconsiderable to an ordinary conscience, would not have created any scruple at all; yet he, though otherwise not scrupulous, in his tenderness apprehended the transgression so deeply, that even then, for its expiation, he enjoined himself a seven years' penance, and each year with great remorse confessed the same. From whence we may gather how angelically pure that blessed soul was which checked so resentively at so minute a thing, and how far it was from harbouring any great offence which it deemed the least heinous. A tender conscience is like a tender eye, which the least mote disturbs and

annoys, making it water to wash off the stain, and express regret that ever it came there (p. 35.)

Speaking of St. Thomas's early bringing up at Court, in consequence of his father's position, this happy reflection comes *en parenthèse* :—

The reputation of Courts hath ever been as of a place where virtue is laughed out of countenance and denied admittance as too coarsely clad for such fine company.

Indeed, Father Strange is fond of using *prosopopeia* : so, speaking of the Saint's humility, he says :—

It is proper to this virtue to empty ourselves of ourselves—that is, of self-love and self-ease, a lazy humour which sews a pillow to every elbow, and is always leaning homewards, that is, not to seek God and His greater glory, but itself.

The saints are for all times and lands; but we cannot help feeling a strong interest and a glow of special pleasure in reading of this entirely English saint. And St. Thomas represents the thirteenth century of our history; he was born within twenty years of its commencement, and died within twenty years of its close. Henry III., in 1265, made him Lord High Chancellor of England, but he was glad soon to resign his seal and burden, and flee to his beloved studies and quiet at Oxford. Here for a long time he was Chancellor of the University; and, finally, in 1275, he was elected Bishop of Hereford. Like his namesake, Becket, Thomas of Hereford was a strenuous upholder of Church right against the might of an unruly time. Fearless of danger and heedless of threat, he resisted the intrusions and high-handed deeds of barons and earls: he even (though with more pain to himself) resisted the uncanonical ruling of his own Metropolitan, John Peccham. In this last conflict he spent his life. He had appealed to the Holy See; had, in spite of his infirmities, undertaken the long journey to Rome; had been received with marks of honour by Martin V.—but before his cause could be fully heard he died at Montefiascone in the August of 1282. He was canonized by Pope John XXII., in 1320, after earnest entreaties and prayer to Rome from all the English bishops and both the 1st and 2nd Edward.

Thus it came to pass that the canonization of the last (?) canonized saint of Catholic England was a great national event, brought about by the prayers of two kings, one archbishop, fifteen bishops, eleven earls, many lords and nobles, to the centre of Catholic unity, for the canonization of a bishop who died appealing to Rome to defend him against the injustice of the Metropolitan of Canterbury.

*Workman and Soldier : A Tale of Paris Life during the Siege and the Rule of the Commune.* By JAMES F. COBB. London: Griffith and Farran. 1880.

THIS is an interesting and most readable story, by a skilled author. The scene is laid in times which can never become commonplace, and whose fertility of incident is so great that their description in history can scarcely be overdone. The writer is not a Catholic,

but there is nothing in the work that is in any way offensive, although there is a tone of "goodness" which sometimes intrudes itself as not quite the genuine thing. This, however, will not prevent readers, especially young people, from enjoying the narrative; and the very fair illustrations which accompany the text will add to their appreciation of the story.

---

*Per Crucem ad Lucem: The Result of a Life.* By T. W. ALLIES, M.A.  
In Two Vols. London: C. Kegan Paul and Co. 1879.

MR. ALLIES has here newly edited and gathered into one book several of his already-published articles and treatises which, together, illustrate the title he has chosen; the Cross being the immediate consequence of his discovery, some thirty years ago, that the Church of which he was a minister was not the Church of Christ—that tearing of himself "up by the roots from the community in which he had lived to middle age and with which all his hopes of prosperity in life were inextricably blended;" the light being that which he found in the Catholic Church. We are glad to see the contents of these two volumes, with the interesting introductions which the author has now added, placed in a position of greater prominence, and in a form which will help to their permanent adoption as an admirable English exponent of a cardinal point in the Catholic claim the authority of the Holy See. The assumption by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth of supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, that supremacy which had hitherto been a Papal claim, resting on Scripture proof, and was now a Royal claim, resting on the Royal proof of assertion, but "untenable and even anti-Christian," was the aspect of the Establishment which drove Mr. Allies from its midst. Naturally, therefore, the doctrine of the supreme doctrinal and moral authority of St. Peter's successor, together with its immediate bearings on dogma, life, and practice, has been his favourite (though by no means his only) study as a Catholic. These volumes give the results of his portion of this life's "thoughts, studies, and prayers;" his discovery of the fact of Royal supremacy; of the nature and effects of it; of the character of the Papal claim; of the foundation of the latter in Christ's own words and its continuous life and growth in history; of the opposite results of the one and the other claim in the daily working of the Catholic Church and of the Anglican Establishment.

Mr. Allies has been too long read, both of the Catholic and non-Catholic English public, to need any words of ours in his praise, whether for his cultivated and forcible style, or for his vast accumulation of reading, or for his happy use of the latter to illustrate his philosophic grasp of Catholic doctrine and view of its connections and consequences. It may be well to say, however, that the first edition of "The See of St. Peter," which forms part of the first of these volumes, was translated into Italian, and circulated by the order of his late Holiness Pius IX., a very high tribute indeed to both the learning and Catholic instincts of the author.

Although Mr. Allies's works were penned long before the date of the

Vatican Council, it is needless to say that they already contended for the infallibility which that Council decreed. This gift of *ex cathedra* inerrancy he had contended was bestowed by our Lord Himself on St. Peter in the three familiar texts from St. Matthew, St. Luke, and St. John; it has been claimed, from the beginning, by Popes, and acknowledged by their subjects; "the infallibility of the Papal See has been, at every great crisis of Church history, required in order to maintain the infallibility of the Church;" "lastly, every canonized saint, since the process of canonization has been instituted, has believed and professed the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. When was the instinct of saintliness known to fail?" Writing, therefore, since the Vatican decision, he naturally rejoices—

In the profound sense of security and delight which such a decision carries with it, the writer cannot but express his gratitude to the Divine Providence which has placed his life at such a time. He rejoices to behold the unequalled grandeur of the Church, assembled from the whole world, and bearing witness to the Rock on which it has been founded, and which through eighteen centuries has supported its weight.

We wish these two volumes of Mr. Allies the success which perhaps he most ardently desires—a large measure of influence in leading Romewards and light-wards those who in the Establishment find themselves in his own former sad state of anxiety and doubt. Many, even among the clergy, may have neither the leisure, nor the ability, nor the means to enter into the crucial question with Mr. Allies's erudition and mental power. May his work be, under God, the happy means of helping them to his own clear conclusions, even at the same cost—*per crucem ad lucem*.

---

*The Institutes of English Law.* By DAVID NASMITH, Esq., LL.B. In Four Vols. Vol. I., Public Law; Vols. II., III., Private Law; Vol. IV., Adjective Law. London: Butterworths. 1873-79.

MR. NASMITH has endeavoured, in these four small volumes, to satisfy a want which he himself felt, he tells us, when he commenced the study of English Law. "That want was a well-defined outline of the entire province of law, filled in with the leading principles of each section—a liberal but possible quantity, which, when mastered, would serve as the framework of a life's study." He has, we think, accomplished his endeavour with success. The volumes may be had separately, according to subjects, and each has full indices, analytical, alphabetical, and of "cases quoted," and is preceded by carefully constructed tables, giving analyses of the subject matter which show at a glance the connection of the various parts.

The volumes are designed for the professed law student, but will be also, we imagine, very useful to the hurried practitioner and the lay inquirer; giving them a not too jejune outline of the legal status and bearings of a question with references to more ample sources of information. They would be of service to priests, either in their studies, as of Canon Law and of several theological tracts, or in their frequent



duty of giving advice on points that involve both moral and legal consequences, however foreign to their immediate profession under the latter aspect, yet unavoidable in actual practice.

The volume on Public Law contains chapters on the origin of law—on the principles common to all legal systems; on Constitutional Law (which is a sketch of our English Constitution from the time of the Conqueror to the present); on International, and on Municipal Law. It might be advantageously studied by the historical and political, no less than by the legal student. The two volumes on Private Law (of persons and things respectively) contain an amount of information, sufficient for ordinary needs, on such subjects as successions and wills, mortgages, relations of landlord and tenant, insurances, husband and wife and divorces, contracts, bankruptcy, and numerous others. The last volume, on Adjective Law (which has for its object, briefly, to show whether a given individual has infringed a rule of the substantive law, and to measure evidence and damages), gives information under such headings as—facts as to which evidence is inadmissible, or unnecessary; facts which must be determined by the judge, and by the jury; the competency of witnesses, documentary evidence, and the like.

In a book dealing with the whole law, both its philosophy and practice, and those abstruse metaphysical questions raised under the former heading, have had to be expounded: a mighty task, demanding a union of the erudite lawyer, largely-read historian, and keen metaphysician. As to the correctness of the technical and practical portion we raise no question. The status and reputation of the author are a sufficient guarantee. We confess to having learned more, from a personal perusal of these volumes, of the condition and working of English law, and of the legal aspect of not a few cases, frequently occurring and indicating a conflict between the law of the Church and the law of the land, than we had done from repeated consultations of larger works on special points of legal practice.

The author has so frequently, by inverted commas, thrown the burden of responsibility as to metaphysics on popular authors, under such heads as—the nature of free-will, morality, positive and natural law, &c., that, dissenting as we do from much of what he quotes, we need do no more here than say so. The history, generally, whether quoted or otherwise, is of that popular kind, prejudiced without suspicion against Catholicism as a system which has so long held undisputed sway in England, but which is now disappearing very gradually and with almost reluctant steps before the light of recent and unbiassed critical study. The effective abolition of traditional side-views and misjudgments, especially when these are enshrined in the magnificent literature of two centuries, is slow work, and it is enough for us to note in passing that the Catholic theology and Canon Law of the "Dark Ages," and more recent times, would show to better advantage in the eyes of English lawyers if they had leisure to look at our own books and records, and would go so far as not to suppose our clergy (Jesuits included) to be preternaturally hypocritical, but, until sound history shows otherwise, believe them to have been actually

guided by the wise and holy rules and ordinances laid down by Pontiff, Council, and Theologian for their guidance.

Such descriptions as that of casuistry, quoted from Sir H. Maine, are as misleading in statement as they are objectionable in tone. Surely it only needs that a lawyer should put aside anti-Catholic (perhaps unconscious) bias to recognise that casuistry has existed through at least all Christianity, and that it is but a natural consequence of man's inability to place at once every event of life under its proper moral or legal obligation; and further, that if at one particular time men abused it, use and abuse are still distinct. Would the fact that there were at one time packed juries, say, in Ireland, justify a condemnation of the jury system in that country?

We assure Mr. Nasmith that a rational casuistry still forms part of every priest's moral theology, and bears to Canon and Divine Law much the same relation that his own Adjective does to Substantive Law; that its object is and ever has been neither to escape the consequences of sin, nor to aid the Catholic Church in the conflict with any sect—such allegations are puerile—but to enable the confessor to judge how far the penitent has been guilty and has incurred canonical or moral consequences; that to assume it is foolish to establish a distinction of sin into mortal and venial is offensive; that casuistry has not been ruined by Pascal or by anybody else; and that moralists of very large influence and sound credit still conduct its speculations—that, for example, St. Alfonso Liguori, Scavini, Cardinal Gousset, Gury, the Abbé Gaume, are very recent examples. The last named, indeed, has been translated into English and published for the use of the Anglican clergy; though it is not so much a book of casuistry as a guide to the casuist, *i.e.*, the confessor.

Bating these defects which neither reflect on the author as a lawyer nor on his book as an exponent of English law, we beg to thank him for a very instructive and useful book, and to commend the book itself for its style, condensation, clearness, and technical accuracy.

*Historical Sketch of the St. Louis University.* By WALTER H. HILL, S. J. St. Louis: Fox. 1879.

FATHER HILL is Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at the Catholic University in St. Louis, and he has done a very good work in presenting us with a sketch of its history, and an account of its fiftieth anniversary. The College of St. Louis, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, was incorporated by Act of the Missouri Legislature in 1832. The number of its students, during the last ten years, seems to have averaged about 400. Father Hill's account is full of interest, of historical matter, of statistics, and of information as to the actual state of this great college. The book will afford invaluable materials to the future historian, and will be read with wonder and thankfulness by all who pray for the enlargement of the kingdom of God.

*Esposizione ragionata della Filosofia di Antonio Rosmini.* Two Vols. Bertolotti. 1878-79. (Consecutive Exposition of the Philosophy of Antonio Rosmini.)

THIS work, which is of very great importance, is an authoritative exposition of the logical, metaphysical, and ethical views of a man who has always inspired his friends with enthusiasm, and all thinkers with respect. Rosmini is one of the most eloquent of modern Italians. The key of his philosophy, as far as any simple explanation holds good, is his intense reaction against the materialistic and "common-sense" philosophy which he found in vogue, even in Catholic schools. He seized and pursued the idea of the intuition of Being—we will not now discuss how far—and his splendid eloquence derived from this prevailing bent of his mind a spiritual, poetical, and even somewhat idealistic tone such as we observe in men of kindred minds, like Fénelon, Thomassin, and Père Gratry. No one can read Rosmini without being purified and elevated. No Catholic philosopher can afford to be unacquainted with him. The present work, which is in two considerable volumes, is a useful guide to the twenty or thirty separate writings of the master. We think these writings of very unequal value. There are pages which are as good as can be; bright and powerful expositions of one or other of the great points of the Thomistic philosophy, and especially that branch in which St. Thomas's pregnant principles require the greatest amount of modern illustration—his Ontology. On the other hand, there is not a little which is laboured, feeble, and even fantastical—as, for instance, Rosmini's theory of corporeal substance. We shall have to return to these volumes.

---

*The Catholic Birthday Book.* Compiled by A LADY. London: Burns & Oates.

*The Birthday Book of Quotations and Autograph Album.* Second Edition. London: Griffith & Farran.

BIRTHDAY BOOKS belong to a class of literature which "sour-complexioned" persons would be inclined to call sentimental. There is no reason, however, why the natural inclination which asserts itself in human nature for marking and remembering one's birthday and the birthdays of one's friends, should not be made useful for culture and even for piety. A man's birthday, though of singularly small importance to the world at large, is not uninteresting to himself; but, if he has learnt to look on life aright, it should be kept rather as a day of solemn retirement than as a festival. It is probable, however, that as long as one has relations, the birthday will be considered an occasion for some rejoicing. Christianity, which has transformed natural feeling, has turned the old Pagan birthday feast into a half-sacred commemoration of baptism and of the acceptance of a saint's name. A good birthday-book, therefore, ought to remind us, at each day of the year, of some holy and supernatural association. It ought to raise the heart to heaven, and throw a gleam of light on the true path of the Christian wayfarer. The pretty book, just published by

Messrs. Burns and Oates, is a good example of such a birthday-book. Each day of the year is illustrated by the name of the saint or festival, by a pious motto, not from Holy Scripture, but from the writings of one of the saints, and by a devout "practice." The opposite page is left blank for names, dates, and even (in moderation) the "sentiments" of the owner or the owner's friends. The other book, at the head of this notice, is not devotional; but it is full of pretty, though sometimes too common-place, quotations and thoughts, expressed in English, in French, or in German.

---

*Practical Notes on Moral Training: Especially Addressed to Parents and Teachers.* With Preface by FATHER GALLWEY, S.J. London: Burns & Oates. 1879.

WE fail to discover in this little work the superlative excellence attributed to it by Father Gallwey in his preface. Nevertheless, it is certainly a sensible, sound, and well-written book. The authoress takes a number of subjects connected with the bringing up of young children—such as Instructions, Example, Discipline, Unselfishness, Temper, Timidity, True Principle, &c.—and explains the importance of attending to the development of character from the very earliest years, giving plain advice which it would be well if parents and teachers would take to heart. The deficiency of the book is that it has no plan, and very little order; and, what is worse for the effect on the reader, the compiler herself seems to have had no scientific ethical training whatever. Such words as Moral Discipline, Interior Life, Passion, Virtue, &c., have a most definite meaning in Christian ethics and a definite place in its development. It does not do, for instance, to define virtue as "supernatural strength given us by God" (p. 135), or the "supernatural life" as "simply that led by the Christian," with no attempt to explain it; to leave the important subject of "Passion" without a definition at all; or to write such a sentence as this:—"We know that the mere knowledge of the Divine law is not principle in the individual, and that it only becomes so when it is put in practice and observed undeviatingly." Some important matters are hardly treated of—for example, the subject of Punishment, and how pain can be made corrective. Then, again, we have nothing about the Sacraments, without which there is no Christian moral training worthy of the name. And, lastly, the whole book has an unfinished and dislocated effect from the absence of unity of idea. It should have been clearer to the readers and to the writer that the object of all training, for child and man, is to make them give their whole heart to God. This fundamental view of the end and object of training, together with the obstacles found in human nature, on the one hand, and the help derived from God, on the other, furnish the "topics" of what can be usefully said on Christian manners and progress.

---

*Germany, Past and Present.* By S. BARING-GOULD, M.A. In Two Vols. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

WE can hardly pronounce this to be a good book, although it is a book with a great deal of good matter in it. The truth is Mr. Baring-Gould has attempted too much both for his powers and for his space. To give an account of "Germany, her Institutions and Culture," not merely "recording observations," but "attempting to explain causes" (Pref. v), is a task of might to which the author is hardly equal. Nor could it possibly have been accomplished in a manner at all adequate within the limits to which he has confined himself. He displays, indeed, a consciousness of this in his preface.

Some of the subjects dealt with in these volumes (he writes) are of such importance that one class of readers may complain that I have treated them too cursorily. My purpose has not been to deal comprehensively with each—to say all that might, or indeed ought, to have been said on each—but to squeeze into single chapters just so much information as will give the reader a general outline and idea of the subject; and for the sake of specialists I have added an appendix of authors who will enable them to master the details of the matter they desire to study. Though each subject has been treated lightly, I trust it has not been dealt with superficially (Pref. p. vii).

Now, we are compelled to say that some of his subjects are treated by Mr. Baring-Gould very superficially. Take, for example, the chapter on the Labour Question in the second volume—one of the burning questions of the day in Germany, as elsewhere. It is a chapter of thirty pages, and might have presented an outline at all events of the main bearings of this great subject, as Teutonic thought views it, in its various aspects. Instead of that, Mr. Baring-Gould gives us a string of outworn commonplaces, and the thinnest leading article philosophy about the principles of trades unions, protection and free trade, seasoned with a quotation from Mr. Mill, and another from Professor Beesley, and varied by a very sketchy and hazy account of mediæval organization of labour. Again, in the chapter on Education in the first volume, out of forty-seven pages, twenty are devoted to a paper contributed by a German usher describing his experiences of certain low-class English schools—an interesting and instructive paper, it is true, but quite out of place in an account of education in Germany, and occupying space which the author was, as it were, under agreement with the reader to assign to very different matters. Once more, in the chapter on Culture, nearly fifty pages are filled with gossip about the German Court of the last century, almost all of which is already familiar enough to the English reader through Mr. Carlyle's "Frederick the Great," and other well-known volumes, and hardly worth repeating once more. With so great a subject and so little space, Mr. Baring-Gould's work ought to have been solid. But it is not. The critic who examines it—

*Dignoscere cautus*

*Quid solidum crepet et pictæ tectoria linguæ,*

is bound to pronounce that there is much of it which does not ring true. Nor is book-making the only offence with which Mr. Baring-

Gould is chargeable. His blunders are numerous and sometimes very gross, and induce a doubt as to his competency for any such work as that which he has undertaken. Thus, he speaks of the "Empire of Austria" as existing in the fifteenth century (vol. i. p. 10), while every schoolboy knows that the Austrian Empire has not been a hundred years in existence. He quotes from a writer whom he designates "the French poet, Diderot" (vol. i. p. 169); a way of describing the renowned encyclopædist, which is more than singular. He makes the astounding statement that "the Roman law saw no distinction between possession and property" (vol. i. p. 68); the truth being that the distinction in question is not only made by Roman law, but is of the highest importance in it. He describes "Joseph II. as a noble emperor, a worthy son of a great good mother" (vol. ii. p. 318); from which we infer that his knowledge of the principles and policy of these two sovereigns must be of the haziest kind. The praise of one of them is almost necessarily dispraise of the other. If Marie Therese was "great and good" as we believe, Joseph must have been little and bad, which we also believe. We give these instances of Mr. Baring-Gould's errors merely by way of specimen. His volume teems with similar mistakes.

So much may suffice by way of explanation why we cannot pronounce this to be a good book. On the other hand, as we have said, there is much good matter in it. The chapter on the German Army is excellently done. The chapter on Social Democracy is very well worth reading. So are the chapters on Music, Women, and the Upper and Lower Nobility. With the chapters on the Kulturkampf and Protestantism Mr. Baring-Gould has evidently taken especial pains, and they are full of interesting information. It should be noted, however, that especial caution is necessary with regard to any statements made by him respecting the Catholic Church; for, in addition to the natural inaccuracy of his mind and the superficial character of his knowledge, his strong prejudice as an Anglican clergyman here militates greatly against his trustworthiness. He is ever haunted by a phantom of "Ultramontanism"—we should like to make him define what he means by it; and like Cardinal Newman's prejudiced man he "sees Jesuits in everything." We should add that one very excellent feature of his work is the Appendix, in which the author subjoins the titles of books of authority upon the various subjects which he has handled. We could wish that he had made greater use of them himself.

---

*Dom Jean Mabillon.* Par HENRI JADART. Reims. 1879.

IN this slender octavo, M. Jadart, a magistrate of Rheims, and a member of the Academy of that city, gives a very interesting sketch of the life, labours, and memorials of his illustrious compatriot. He makes considerable use of the life written by Dom Ruinart, but adds many noteworthy details from the "Correspondence inédite," published by M. Valéry in 1847, and from the large mass of documents concerning Mabillon which are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. Some of these are given at length in an Appendix.



We may mention, as of special interest, the account of the honours paid to the remains of Mabillon, Monfaucon, and Descartes, in 1799 and in 1819. At the suggestion of an ex-member of the Directory, and by order of the Minister of the Interior, the remains of John Mabillon, and of Bernard Montfaucon, religious of the *ci-devant* Abbey of St. Germain-des-Près, illustrious by their learned researches and luminous writings, were removed from the Lady Chapel of the Abbey, then used as a warehouse, to the Musée des Monuments Français (!). There they rested for twenty years, in company with Boileau, la Fontaine, Descartes, Molière, Jacques Rohaut, Abelard, and Heloise. In 1819 the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres obtained permission to transport the remains of Descartes, and of the two Benedictines, to the parish church of St. Germain-des-Près, where they now repose side by side. Last year the Academy of Rheims placed a memorial tablet in the Church of St. Pierremont, where Mabillon was baptized, and it was in order to celebrate this event that M. Jadart composed this volume.

---

*Etude sur les Sarcophages Chrétiens Antiques de la Ville d'Arles.* Par M. EDMOND LE BLANT. Paris : Imprimerie Nationale. 1878.

THOSE of our readers who are interested in Christian archæology, and especially in ancient Christian art, must often have desired to make a more intimate acquaintance with the sculptured sarcophagi of Arles, to which they will have met with such frequent reference. But, up to the publication of the present work, nothing short of a personal visit to the place would have given them the means of gratifying that desire.

It was not till towards the close of the last century that any attempt was made to bring together and preserve these ancient monuments even within the city itself. Before that time, they had been given away to antiquarians who cared to take them, or they had been built into the walls of churches, or of public and private buildings, or placed in the vestibule and portico of the Hôtel de Ville, the court of the archiepiscopal palace, or any other convenient space which would not refuse to give shelter to such cumbrous lumber. But, in the year 1784, Père Dumont, a Friar Minim, persuaded the municipal authorities to collect them in the nave of a ruined and roofless church, over the doorway of which was henceforth inscribed *Musée*. Unfortunately, this only served to make them a more conspicuous object, and a more easy prey to the fury of the Revolution which broke out ten years later, and was not likely to spare such venerable monuments of Christianity. In 1815, all that had survived those terrible days were again brought together into another desecrated church (of St. Anne), henceforth called the Museum; and here they have ever since remained, in company with Pagan monuments of various kinds.

The richness of even this miserable residue of the Early Christian monuments of Arles is not surpassed by any other collection out of Rome; and Christian archæologists have often expressed an earnest desire that some Bosio or Aringhi might be found to make them acces-

sible to the learned world generally by means of accurate copies. Before M. Le Blant, this had hardly been attempted. Millin, indeed, in his well-known "*Voyage dans les départements du Midi de la France*," had given copies of a few, but they were so wretchedly executed, and even, if we may trust M. Le Blant, so designedly tampered with by his unscrupulous draughtsman, that they were practically worthless. Perhaps it may not have been altogether the fault of the artist; something must be allowed to the general ignorance of the subjects represented, which was a characteristic of the age in which these copies were taken. With our present knowledge it is easy to laugh at the blunder which could see in the paralytic, carrying on his shoulders his upturned bedstead; a picture of Samson carrying the gates of Gaza; or in a boy holding a bird which pecks at a bunch of grapes, a picture of one of the twelve spies who brought back a branch with its cluster of grapes from the Promised Land. But we must not forget that the first of these mistakes was made also by Bosio's artists when the Catacombs were first re-discovered, and that the same persons failed to recognise Noah's Ark in the strange conventional form under which it appears in primitive Christian art, and not unnaturally conjectured that the scene before them was intended to represent some Christian priest or bishop preaching in a pulpit, whilst the Holy Spirit, under the form of a dove, inspires him what he shall say. However, whether the blunders of Millin's artist were the fruit of malice or of ignorance, at least they spoilt his work and rendered it absolutely useless. Nor were Père Dumont's endeavours much more successful; whilst Père Martin's, in more recent times, though leaving nothing to desire on the score of accuracy, were too limited in number to satisfy the demands of archaeologists. We rejoice, therefore, that M. Le Blant has been able to publish, at the expense of the French Government, the present handsome volume, consisting of upwards of thirty good lithographs, illustrated by some seventy pages of text. It is published under the direction of the Minister of Public Instruction, as belonging to the Third (or Archæological) Section of the "*Collection des Monuments inédits sur l'Histoire de France*." It is only a selection after all; but M. Le Blant assures us that it contains all that is most valuable and interesting in the collection.

Even the most cursory glance at the pictures is sufficient to show the very close resemblance that existed between the Christian monumental sculpture of Arles and of Rome. The first impression is, that only the same subjects are treated, and only in the same way; and if a closer inspection reveals a few minor differences, at least it is quite clear that we may say of ancient Christian sculpture what has been said of ancient Christian epitaphs, that there is an absolute agreement in the general tone and sense and character of the whole, though there may be at the same time a certain preference given to one form before another in certain localities. But, in truth, between Arles and Rome there was hardly any difference at all worth speaking of. Only one important exception must be made to this remark. It had already been pointed out by De Rossi, and we observe that the remark is confirmed by Le Blant, that at the corners of the sarcophagi, where the Pagans

usually placed huge masks, and where the Roman Christians carved the heads of SS. Peter and Paul, the sculptors of Arles represented the head of a young beardless man, in whom it is obvious to recognise, by analogy, the special patron of Arles, its youthful martyr—*Genesius*.

M. Le Blant assigns the fourth and fifth centuries as the probable date of the monuments which he has published; and there can be no doubt that this is their real age; and, like their contemporaries in Rome, they represent our Blessed Lord, either alone, with a volume in His hand or giving the volume to one of His Apostles, or surrounded by them all; multiplying the loaves and fishes; changing the water into wine; giving sight to the blind, or healing the paralytic; raising to life the son of the widow of Nain, or healing the *Hæmorrhœissa*. To this M. Le Blant adds, in two or three instances, the giving of the keys to S. Peter; but he acknowledges that *Père Cahier* believes the objects in question to be fishes, not keys; and although our author assures us that he has perfectly satisfied himself upon the point by personal inspection, we must confess to a lingering doubt in our own minds. He says that he has seen the same subject on sarcophagi in Rome, Ravenna, and Pisa; but not, we think, on monuments of the same antiquity. There are also the usual subjects from the Old and New Testaments—Adam and Eve, the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, of Isaac, Moses receiving the Law, and striking the rock, Job and his wife, Daniel among the lions, or slaying the dragon by poison, the Three Children in the fiery furnace, the denial of our Lord by S. Peter and his arrest by the Jews, and the raising of Lazarus. M. Le Blant adds to these, the raising to life of *Tabitha*, or *Dorcas*, by S. Peter; but here again we are not quite sure that he has read his picture aright. No doubt, the actual figures in the scenes correspond better to the literal truth of that history than to any other which we can suggest; but then, as M. Le Blant himself freely acknowledges, or rather makes a great point of insisting upon, the Early Christian painters and sculptors were by no means particular in giving a faithful and literal translation into the language of their art, of the stories they selected for representation.

The most original and interesting portion of the present volume is to be found in the Preface, where, however, we cannot always recognise the authors whose theories are combated. Thus, M. Le Blant complains that, on the faith of a text of the eighth century, there seems to be a settled belief in the minds of some men that the Church of primitive times guided, as it were, the hand of the artist, and that therefore every detail of their work was intended to have a special significance and value; and he proceeds to urge very cogent arguments against this belief. But we cannot help thinking that he has here been setting up ninepins for the sake of the pleasure of knocking them down. We claim to have a tolerably extensive acquaintance with what has been written on this subject; and we have never come across any indications of this settled belief, nor can we call to mind any writer of name who insists on giving a mystical meaning to every detail in the works of Early Christian art. Certainly De Rossi does

not. On the contrary, he expressly discountenances such an idea, as his English epitomatize have taken care to inform us. They have themselves also condemned the language of some Protestant writers on the subject as exaggerated. Yet we observe that some critics, in their reviews of this volume, have seemed to insinuate that the school of De Rossi is precisely that which M. Le Blant is aiming at.

One of these Protestant critics has allowed himself to be so blinded by prejudice, as actually to set before his readers the following as a correct summary of Le Blant's views:—"Frankly accepting," he says, "the principle of symbolism as an acknowledged truth, he wisely restricts it to those scenes where it has either direct Scriptural warrant, or that of the Liturgies and Offices of the Primitive Church." We need hardly say that these conditions of restriction have been elicited from the inner consciousness of an Anglican reviewer, not unmindful of the Thirty-nine Articles. What M. Le Blant actually says is this: "To deny the introduction of symbolism into the ancient works of Christian art is far removed from my thoughts. The monuments themselves would suffice to establish the fact, even if the Gospel and the testimony of the Fathers did not oblige us to recognise it. I shall have occasion in the following pages to give examples of the application of a system so familiar to the faithful. But this will only be when the facts themselves impose it by their distinctness and their harmony, and when the proof of a mystical meaning is (so to speak) self-evident." It is obvious, however, to remark that this canon is capable of very various and shifting interpretations. What is self-evident to one man is far from being so clear to another; nay, the same person may make a different estimate of the degree of evidence at one time from what he does at another. Certainly Le Blant himself unhesitatingly admits several instances of symbolism, which we suspect his Protestant eulogist will fail to see, such as the Holy Eucharist under the symbols of ordinary food brought by the prophet Habacuc to Daniel in the lions' den, the substitution of S. Peter for Moses as "the leader of the new Israel," &c. Nay, in one place he does not hesitate to suggest that perhaps the figure of Moses taking off his shoe was used, solely because the psalm *In exitu Israel* was a part of the ancient funeral service.

This is his one special source of interpretation; and he has used it with great perseverance and success. He takes the *Ordo Commendationis Animæ*, and the prayers for the dying or the dead which occur in the most ancient liturgies; and in these, most especially in the former, he finds nearly all the most common subjects of Ancient Christian art. Anybody who will refer to the Ritual, and study the beautiful Litany, so to call it, in which the priest is there taught to call upon God to deliver the soul of the dying man, even as He had before times delivered these and those of His chosen servants out of special and extreme perils, will find, by the time he has finished it, that he has passed in review most of the histories which furnished subjects to the pencil or the chisel of Early Christians. Whether they be taken as containing salutary lessons of confident hope in God's assistance, or as faint types and figures of a future resurrection, the deliverance of Noe from the deluge, of Isaac from the altar of sacrifice, of Elias from

the common lot of men, of Daniel from the lions, of Susanna from her false accusers, of Jonas from the whale's belly, of the Three Children from the fiery furnace, and of S. Peter out of prison—all these are equally appropriate in prayers for the sick, and on monuments of the dead. Of course, there is nothing new in this suggestion of Le Blant's. It was pointed out by some of the earliest writers on the Catacombs that many of the principal subjects represented in them were brought together in a single passage of the Apostolical Constitutions, and there applied to the doctrine of the Resurrection. But M. Le Blant has pursued the idea more perseveringly than any of his predecessors, and with a proportionately greater success. It must not be supposed, however, as he himself acknowledges, that Christian artists followed only one idea; and perhaps our author shows an inclination to bear somewhat too exclusively on his favourite topic.

Another subject on which M. Le Blant writes sharply and, in our judgment, not quite justly, is the disposition which he detects in some authors to insist on a mystical or theological meaning in the order of arrangement of the several subjects carved on a sarcophagus or painted in the successive compartments of the vaulted ceiling of a *cubiculum*. He speaks of some German author, whom, however, he does not name, who read in the juxtaposition of the Adoration by the wise men, Noah's ark, and the story of Jonas, a mystical representation of the first calling of a Christian soul, its baptism, and then its resurrection to everlasting glory; in fact, a literal translation, in paint or stone, of those words of Our Blessed Lord, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." For ourselves, we think our choice between the French and the German interpretation would depend very materially on the order in which the subjects were really arranged by the artist. We cannot at this moment call to mind any instance in which they succeed one another in the order indicated. It would certainly be a most peculiar order to have selected; one which could not be justified as historical, whether we read it straightforward or backwards; but if this order has anywhere been actually adopted, we think it would be more charitable (and quite as likely to be true) to give the artist credit for knowing his Bible and Catechism, and for consciously expressing a true sequence of theological ideas, than to set him down as a clumsy artist and a shatter-brained ignoramus. We can more readily subscribe to another remark of M. Le Blant's—viz., that probably one principal aim of the Christian as of the Pagan artists was the happy composition of their work. They considered how they could best balance the several parts so as to produce an harmonious whole; yet even here we do not see why we should gratuitously attribute to the Christian artist an ignorance of his religion and of the interpretation of the several incidents of its history, which preachers were continually inculcating and which found its place both in the solemn offices of the Church and in the hymns sung by the people. Thus, whilst it is undeniable that the figure of Moses striking the rock forms a most convenient subject for one extremity of a sarcophagus and at the same time an admirable pendant to Lazarus standing up in his *heroum* at the other, we cannot think that it is necessary to believe that the artist failed to see and to appreciate the

theological fitness of the arrangement, whereby he was setting before the eyes of the faithful a sensible image of the "fountain of water," which was opened by the Gospel dispensation, and "sprang up into life everlasting." These ideas were of incessant recurrence in Christian sermons, and must needs have been quite familiar to the people. Why should the artist be excluded from their influence?

J. S. N.

---

*Reflections delivered during Mid-Day Celebrations of Holy Communion in the Church of St. Mary-le-Strand.* By ALFRED BOWEN EVANS, D.D., Rector. London: John Hodges. 1876.

THE late Dr. Evans was in his way a power in the Church of England. Beginning life, we believe, as a Dissenting minister in Wales, he, after a time, embraced Anglicanism, and enjoyed much fame for many years as a preacher at St. Andrew's, Wells Street, where he was Evening Lecturer. Seventeen years ago he obtained the small living of St. Mary-le-Strand, and there he remained until he died last year.

The volume before us is a collection of short addresses delivered at the celebration of the Anglican Communion in his church, where, as he tells us in the preface, an effort had been made, not without success, to render the Eucharist the service of the congregation. The fact that such an effort was made by him will be enough to indicate to those who did not know him the school of Anglicanism to which Dr. Evans belonged. He was one of the best specimens of it: not, strictly speaking, indeed, a learned man, but of considerable theological reading, and of wide general cultivation; earnestly religious and endowed with much hortatory power. His discourses are perhaps too rhetorical to satisfy a correct taste, and his fondness for antithesis sometimes carried him away. But they were doubtless effective when delivered, and are full of telling sayings, which dwell in the memory. Dr. Evans was of much service to many in guiding them towards the one Church which, alas! he himself never entered. Why did he not enter it? He gives an answer in one of his sermons which is so characteristic that we will quote it. He says:—

Now, there is but one Church, or one portion of the divided Church (for the fact of division is not to be overcome by *un-Churching*) which ventures to claim the allegiance of all Christian people; to wit, the Church in communion with the Bishop of Rome, the successor of St. Peter. She does put forth this claim, and admits of one, and but one, excuse for not yielding to it—viz., the plea of what it calls "invincible ignorance." Here we cannot but join issue. Suppose a man cannot, and will not, and, in duty to conscience and to God, dare not, plead such ignorance, or consent to have it pleaded for him, what then? Supposing it were said to me, or to one or other of you, not so ignorant as I am, "Nothing but 'invincible ignorance' hinders your becoming a member of the Roman Catholic Church;" I should reply, No; I plead no such ignorance, neither do I wish any one to plead it for me. It is not "invincible ignorance," unfortunately, that forbids my submission to your obedience, but, rather, invincible knowledge. Did I know less about her, I might submit to



your Church; knowing as much as I do, I cannot. Her history supports not her demand (p. 210).

We regret that Dr. Evans never drew out his historical argument against the Church, and we regret it for his sake. We cannot but think that had he done so, his naturally candid mind would have discerned that after all it was ignorance and not knowledge that stood in his way. It is notorious how many eminent German scholars have been led to the Church by the study of history; and to take an instance nearer home, "The great manifest historical phenomenon which converted" Cardinal Newman was, as we know from his own testimony, "the identity of the Catholicism of to-day with the Catholicism of antiquity" ("Ang. Difficulties," p. 321). The truth is that Dr. Evans can hardly be said to have believed in the Church in any true sense. This comes out in the sermon from which we are quoting, in the concluding portion of which he writes, "In her corporate capacity, alas! the Church is no longer an adequate witness for Christ. It is to the power of individual testimony that we must look." It is quite true that if the claim of Rome is unfounded, the Church not only is not an adequate witness for Christ, but cannot be said even to exist in a corporate capacity. As Cardinal Newman has said elsewhere, "To believe in a Church is to believe in the Pope" (Letter to the Duke of Norfolk). A letter written by Dr. Evans to a friend who had recently been received into the Catholic Church lies before us, and may perhaps be fittingly inserted here—it has never before been printed—as serving to illustrate the writer's state of mind:

June 10, 1877.

MY DEAR —,

From Mr. — I learned some little while since the step which you had been induced to take in relation to the Church. I cannot but regret that you had not had a little conversation with me on the subject previously. You would sure, I need scarcely say, to have found in me one able to sympathise with you in your difficulties, and one who would not have plied you with those dissuasives which, as they long since failed to have power with me, would not, I suppose, have been very powerful with you. It is somewhat singular that at the time I was informed of your change a gentleman whom I have long known should have sought me, under, I assume, perplexities similar to your own. You will have gained much probably and lost much by your transition.

We cannot help observing how refreshing the contrast is between the tone of this letter and that of a volume recently published with the imprimatur of a great Society, which may in some sort, we suppose, be regarded as a representative Anglican body. However much we may deplore the position Dr. Evans held, the note of good faith is as strongly upon his words as is the note of bad faith upon the diatribes of Dr. Littledale.

---

*The Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D.; with Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence.* By A. R. ASHWELL, M.A.  
Vol. I. London: John Murray. 1880.

THE late Samuel Wilberforce was an able and successful Anglican minister, a skilful man of the world, and endowed with many

good qualities of mind and heart. The thing that grates on one's feelings, in this first instalment of his biography, is that he was called a Christian Bishop. He was a man who never had the smallest conception of what the Church of Christ really is. He never got beyond Anglicanism—an indescribable compound, made up of strong Protestantism, British patriotism, and accidental survivals of the Middle Ages—or, in other words, of opposition to the Pope, servility to the Crown, and several names and notions adhered to for no particular reason when England broke away from Rome. There is a charming letter in this volume written to Wilberforce when he had just been appointed Bishop of Oxford, by the late Prince Albert. The Prince, who to his many private virtues and public talents did not unite an acquaintance with elementary divinity, undertakes to instruct the newly-elected Bishop in the duties of his office. The letter is almost cynically plain spoken, and must have given Wilberforce—who fondly retained through life a vague idea that he had something in common with St. Ambrose, St. Anselm, and St. Charles Borromeo—an unpleasant sense of his position as a salaried servant of the State. It is to be regretted that we have no record of his reply to this letter. His answer would no doubt have brought out into yet clearer relief that "caution" and "moderation" which enabled him to ascend so agreeably from one preferment to another during his life; to become a high favourite at Court, to hang on to the skirts of the Oxford Tractarians, and to cultivate a fine, ignorant, but gentlemanly Toryism, while all the time he was always ready to revile the Pope, to extol the "glorious Reformation," and to make sounding speeches about the virtues of the people. His biography, however, for these very reasons, is full of interest. This first volume—(the whole life will take up at least three)—brings us down to the end of the Hampden controversy. Canon Ashwell, who unfortunately died before the volume was out, has done his work with ability and with apparent honesty. There is, perhaps, too much "reflecting" and "summing up" in the book—too much calling attention to points which are perfectly obvious. And the letters might surely have been printed without keeping all the contractions which the writers used in the hurry of writing. But no one who cares for a picture of the stirring days from 1830 to 1846 will miss reading it right through. It is a picture in many respects different from any which has yet been given to the world. We have the comments of this shrewd, far-seeing man on the various phases of the Oxford movement, and on its leaders—comments which are often so rude and so indiscriminating that it is almost an indiscretion to publish them whilst the objects of them are still amongst us. We have Wilberforce's observations on Pusey, on Newman, on Ward (for whose deprivation of his degree he heartily voted), on the Jerusalem Bishopric (which he warmly supported, being then flatteringly intimate with Bunsen, and thinking the King of Prussia a noble ruler), and on the Hampden question. This latter is gone into at great length; but, exhaustive as the discussion is, there are one or two matters left out. Enough, however, is given to exhibit a gifted and not dishonest mind in the direst straits; to show a clever Anglican almost beside himself

with the difficulty of reconciling Anglicanism with Christianity. The more the Hampden question is known in all its bearings the more complete is the pulverization of the Anglican theory. Lord John Russell's cool and Mephistophelean letters alone are more effective than a dozen disputations of a new Bellarmine. We wish we had space to go into other useful matters treated in this biography. But when it is further advanced there will be other occasions of considering it.

---

*Lectures on Ritualism.* By FATHER GALLWEY, S.J. London :  
Burns & Oates. 1880.

FATHER GALLWEY'S Lectures ought to be read by all Catholics who are desirous of doing spiritual good to the earnest-minded men who form the bulk of Ritualistic congregations. They will find in these pages a ready, and often a very homely answer, to the difficulties experienced by Anglicans, when the duty of submission to the authority of the Apostolic See is brought home to them. The personal goodness of their leaders, the assurance given them that in doctrinal teaching they are one with the Early Church, and above all their feeling of conviction that the ministers of the Establishment are really priests, hold them back and claim fidelity to Anglicanism. Father Gallwey devotes two or three lectures to each of these points, and shows how void are these arguments of reality and even plausibility. He proves that the supposed sanctity of the Ritualistic clergy can be no criterion of a Divine commission to teach men in Christ's name, and that the outcome of such a theory is the practical substitution of Naturalism for Divine Faith. This leads him in his second lecture to contrast the orthodox priest of God, though unfaithful, with the amiable but heterodox Ritualistic clergyman :

S. Paul's idea, then, of the priesthood, was not that they should be amiable men teaching each a gospel of his own, but rather that idea which the Holy Ghost sets before us by the mouth of the Prophet Malachi: "The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth." The Christian priest is to be not a leader followed for the sake of his personal qualities ; he is one of the appointed body of apostles, who have a commission, and who through communion with the Vicar of Christ, partakes in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and therefore is to be trusted. He is a nameless man, and has no followers. Consequently, brethren, though it is always a terrible calamity when a priest of God's Church scandalizes his flock by leading a life unworthy of his vocation, yet if it were unhappily necessary to choose between two evils, I am not afraid to say that an unfortunate priest who has been known occasionally to sin by intemperance or dishonesty or immorality, so long as he faithfully hands down sound doctrine, is not by any means so terrible a scourge as a refined clergyman, who has an appearance of godliness, but, day after day, not only teaches false doctrine, but utterly saps and destroys faith by teaching the very principle and essence of heresy—that is to say, by teaching the flock who trust him the fatal sin of choosing out for themselves such doctrines as please them, and rejecting others not convenient. Priest and people thus remain for

ever under the withering condemnation of St. Paul, they are "ever learning and never attaining to the knowledge of the truth" (pp. 54, 55).

Indifference to a Divine commission in the preacher, and an inordinate regard for personal merit, will sooner or later lead to a complete disregard for truth in dogmatic teaching. Three hundred years ago Protestants held certain positive doctrines. However erroneous these might be, yet they were often real convictions, and the very presence of those who called them heretical, roused the Reformers to fury and even cruel bloodshed. Now-a-days the Anglican is taught and trained to bear the doctrinal contradictions of his pulpit with a patience that affects heroic sanctity.

The most instructive of Father Gallwey's lectures are those that treat of the positive assurance the Ritualistic clergy give their flock, that by virtue of their study of the works of the Fathers, and by the soundness of their Patristic teaching, the people of England are being really saved from the errors of Romanism and brought back to the Christianity which was given to England by St. Augustine, its Apostle. These men profess a certain reverence for the successors of St. Gregory the Great in the Roman See, but with sad hearts they bewail their innovations in doctrine, and their unjust usurpation of spiritual authority. They live in hope that a Pontiff may yet arise who will virtually give up his supremacy, and agree to say nothing about either infallibility or Anglican Orders. Father Gallwey bids those who indulge in these day-dreams to look facts in the face, and not to shrink from the stern duty which honest inquiry must ever entail. If they reject the Protestant principle of private judgment they must believe in a living Church. The polity of that living Church must be sought in the Holy Gospels, and not in tracts issued by writers too often convicted of gross misrepresentations. In the fifth lecture they meet with remarks highly conducive to a fruitful perusal of certain important passages of the New Testament. If they be men of good-will a time must arrive when they will clearly see how vain is the claim of the Anglian Ritualists to be regarded as the true exponents of the doctrine and authority of the Early Church.

Father Gallwey appeals to ecclesiastical documents of no little importance, and shows what was the spiritual power wielded by the Roman Pontiffs in the age of the great Fathers of the Church, and what were the doctrines they taught as supreme teachers of the Universal Church. Popes St. Celestine, St. Leo the Great, and St. Gregory the Great are proved to be of one mind as to the office vested in the successor of St. Peter. Their exercise of power is found identical, when dealing with proud men who questioned or rejected their vicarious authority. Even the great patriarchs of the East had either to obey the decisions of the Bishop of Rome, or to be accounted guilty of schism, and struck with the sword of excommunication.

The fond conceit laid up in the Ritualistic bosom, that the purity of Patristic teaching is theirs, and is no longer to be found in the Apostolic See, or in that world-wide Church of which it is the centre, is treated by Father Gallwey in three excellent popular lectures. He repro-

duces in several extracts from the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon the faith and discipline common to the East and West. Nothing could be more unlike the Anglican Establishment even in its most advanced School of Ritualism. Almost every document to be met in the acts of the third and fourth General Councils undeniably testifies to the prerogatives of the See of St. Peter. Hence it is that Anglicans dare not trust themselves to the perusal and attentive study of these ancient records. Those who, like an eminent convert, give their whole heart and soul to the task, cannot fail to submit to that authority which all true Catholics must acknowledge and obey.

Faith in the Apostolic See fosters in the soul a ready and ever dutiful obedience. The light of this grace renders of merely secondary importance the reality of Anglican Orders. It is idle to make this issue the great and primary question between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion. Still more unreasonable is it to appeal to over-wrought feelings of devotional emotion as a safe and sure criterion of valid orders in the National Church. When the Ritualist has come to believe with St. Peter Chrysologus "that the Blessed Peter yet liveth in his own see, and giveth the true faith to all who seek it," he will, without any difficulty, acknowledge that so grave a question as the very existence of sacerdotal and episcopal powers in men, called priests and bishops, is one which can only be judged by him to whom the keys of authority have been delivered by Christ. Father Gallwey has done well to state in plain words these very simple truths.

---

*Movements in Religious Thought.*—I. Romanism. II. Protestantism.

III. Agnosticism. Three Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in the Lent Term, 1879, by C. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. London: Macmillan. 1879.

IT is a large subject which Professor Plumptre has approached in these three sermons. The age, he discerns, is characterized by a floating, transitional, unsettled state of feeling. It is an age, as he truly says, in which we find a great number of people asking, Who will show us any good? with an earnestness which for many previous generations was but faintly displayed. Whether Professor Plumptre succeeded in these discourses in showing the University of Cambridge any good, we do not venture to determine. At all events, he has set forth with much ability on the whole—although, as we shall hereafter point out, with great want of accuracy in some respects—the leading characteristics, as they present themselves to his mind, of Catholicism, Protestantism, and what, for want of a better word, is called Agnosticism. It will be impossible for us, in the brief space at our command here, to follow him through all the matters upon which he touches in his hundred and twenty pages. We must confine our remarks to the first of his discourses, in which he considers the Catholic religion, or, as he terms it, Romanism.

And first we note with pleasure that he begins with a frank dis-

claimer of the foul virulence and blatterant abuse of the older Protestant controversialists. He admits that "the secret of the fascination Rome has exercised" lies in the fact that she alone claims to be able to satisfy the craving after truth of "one who would fain have something certain to rest on" (p. 16); and elsewhere he draws out the influences of another kind which she exercises over minds differently constituted from those of the inquirers who seek simply for intellectual certainty, influences which arise from—

the long history that stretches back into the remote past—the wide extent of her sway, and the apparent unity that rests on her central authority—the stately impressiveness of her ritual, affecting the imagination through the senses, and the emotions through the imagination—the provision which she makes for sin-burdened consciences by her system of confession and absolution—the hope which she offers to those who mourn for their dead of a remedial and purifying discipline after death, bringing to completeness the holiness without which no man shall see the Lord, and which, when their earthly course was finished, was but incomplete and almost rudimentary—the high ideal of saintly and self-devoted life which has been aimed at and not seldom realised, in her religious communities of men and women (p. 28).

Now, this is true. Catholicism alone, among the religions of the world, embraces all sides of a man's nature, satisfying his intellect and his affections, and guiding his life. And Mr. Plumptre deserves credit for stating it so frankly. Of course he holds there is a set-off, or he would not be where he is. But in the case which he makes against Catholicism there are so many misconceptions and mis-statements as to cause us to think that either he has given very small study to the subject, or that he had not a very high opinion of the critical powers of his hearers in the University of Cambridge. We do not profess to point out here all the errors into which he has fallen. There is hardly a page in this sermon on Romanism in which one or more may not be found. All we can do is to take a few at haphazard as specimens.

I. Professor Plumptre asserts that the Catholic Church assumes it to be the purpose of God "that each soul should have the means of attaining to an unerring judgment on all questions which the speculative intellect may raise as to the being of God and His dealings with mankind" (p. 16).

Whence can Professor Plumptre have derived this astounding thesis? Of course the Catholic Church assumes nothing of the kind. She is well aware with the Apostle that we know in part. "*Totum desinit in mysterium*" is a commonplace of her theologians.

II. Professor Plumptre states that the Catholic Church in her latest developments "abandons the appeal to an unbroken tradition, and to the authority of the Church as represented in her Councils" (p. 17).

The precise contrary is the truth. The method pursued by the Catholic Church in her latest developments is identical with that pursued in her earliest.

III. Professor Plumptre tells us that the claim of the Catholic Church to infallibility "resolves itself at last into the *a priori* assumption that there must be an infallible guide somewhere, and that the only



Church which assumes to be such a guide must, *ipso facto*, be warranted in its assumption" (p. 20).

This is a strange misrepresentation—or rather a ludicrous distortion—of the antecedent argument for an infallible arbiter of faith and morals, drawn out by Cardinal Newman with such power in his "Essay on Development." That argument, extending as it does through seventeen pages (pp. 75-92 in the last edition), is too long to be reproduced here. But we venture very earnestly to beg Professor Plumptre to peruse it carefully. We are sure he would rise from its study with little disposition to exhibit such a parody of it as that which we have quoted to a learned body.

IV. Professor Plumptre observes: "The well known *Bellum Papale* of the Sixtine and Clementine Editions of the Vulgate, each stamped with an *ex cathedra* authority, and containing some 3000 variations in their texts, remains as a witness that the claim [of Papal infallibility] which had by that time been made could not bear the test of even superficial criticism" (p. 24).

What does Professor Plumptre mean by talking of "editions of the Vulgate stamped with an *ex cathedra* authority?" The most superficial study of the elements of the question would suffice to show Professor Plumptre that "Papal infallibility" has no more to do than the man in the moon with the merits of the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the Vatican.

V. Professor Plumptre, animadverting upon what he is pleased to call "a monstrous growth of Mariolatry," observes:—

It is not without interest to note that the extracts given by Dr. Pusey from works published with more or less authority from Roman Catholic Bishops, and in wide use throughout their flocks, are enough to move even Dr. Newman to language almost as strong as any Protestant could desire: "I consider them calculated to prejudice inquirers, to frighten the unlearned, to unsettle consciences, to provoke blasphemies, to work the loss of souls. . . . I know not to what authority to go for them—to Scripture, or to the Holy Fathers, to the decrees of Councils, or to the consent of Schools, or to the tradition of the faithful, or to reason" (Letter to Dr. Pusey, pp. 120, 121).

Cardinal Newman has perhaps suffered more from misquotations than any man living. In the great majority of cases this may be due to ignorance. We will charitably hope it is. But whatever other excuse may be available for Professor Plumptre, *that* can hardly be urged. And indeed we know not what to say to his citation from Cardinal Newman of the words he quotes, without the very important limitations with which the Cardinal introduces them. "After such explanations," Cardinal Newman writes, "and with such authorities to clear my path, I put away from me, as you would wish, without hesitation, as matters in which my heart and reason have no part (*when taken in their literal and absolute sense, as any Protestant would naturally take them, and as the writer doubtless did not use them*), such sentences and phrases." The *italics* are ours. We use them merely for Professor Plumptre's benefit.

But we have said enough; nor should we have said so much had it not been for the reputation which Professor Plumptre enjoys and the

position he holds. It is disheartening to find a gentleman of such wide cultivation, who is a professed teacher of Divinity, betraying a recklessness or an ignorance in theological controversy which would be discreditable to the least advanced of his pupils.

---

*Winds of Doctrine. Being an Examination of the Modern Theories of Automatism and Evolution.* By CHARLES ELAM, M.D. Second Edition. Smith and Elder.

WE noticed this book at some length when it first appeared. We are glad to have an opportunity of again calling attention to it, for we know not where else to find, in so short a compass, so able an exposure of much presumptuous dogmatism which passes current under the name of Science. By way of specimen of Dr. Elam's book, we will here present the concluding portion of it:—

All that is said by Professor Huxley is very little more than an amplification of what was clearly and tersely set forth by Lamarck more than sixty years ago. Lamarck discerned with perfect clearness the strict logical dependence of Human Automatism upon a physical theory of life. It will be evident from a consideration of the following extracts from the introduction to his "*Histoire Naturelle des Animaux sans Vertèbres*," how little progress has been made in this department of biological science since his days:—"Every fact or phenomena that can be observed is essentially physical. . . . All movement or change, every acting force, and every effect whatever, are due necessarily to mechanical causes, governed by laws. . . . Every fact or phenomenon observed in a living body is at once a physical phenomenon and a product of organization" (Preface, p. 11, *et seq.*) He further refers to these physical phenomena as "constituting life" (p. 12), and to sensation and thought being due to changes in a "particular system of organs capable of giving rise to these physical, mechanical, and organic phenomena." From these general principles the conclusions are natural and inevitable, that "all living bodies or organisms are subject to the same natural laws as are lifeless or inorganic bodies; that the ideas and faculties of the mind generally are but manifestations of movements in the central nervous system;" and, finally, that "*the Will is in truth never free.*"

But, be the doctrine new or old, it cannot be denied that it is a strictly logical deduction from the postulate.

If man is but the product of the molecular forces of matter, from which he is evolved without the "intervention of any but what are termed secondary causes;" if he is merely a "co-ordinated term of Nature's great progression," or a result of "the interaction of organism and environment through cosmic ranges of time," then he is, indeed, hopelessly and helplessly, a mere automaton, with neither choice, will, nor responsibility. But if, on the other hand, it has been or can be proved that such doctrines find no support from science, from observation, from experiment, or from reason—and this, we may interpose, Dr. Elam seems to us to have satisfactorily established—then the doctrine of Human Automatism is relegated to the domain of all such "figments of the imagination," and man may trust implicitly to the consciousness which tells him that he is no mere machine, but a responsible free agent, with duties to perform to his God, his neighbour, and himself; and a conscience to prick him if he performs them not.

*The Most Rev. James Macdevitt, D.D., Bishop of Raphoe: a Memoir.*  
By the Rev. JOHN MACDEVITT, D.D., &c. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.

THE subject of this memoir was admired and beloved by a large circle of friends in his own country, and universally in his own diocese. Reasons are given us in the volume for thinking that a longer life was alone needed to have placed the Bishop of Raphoe in a much more prominent and leading position; indeed, we are told as much in a quotation from one of the Bench of Irish Bishops. This elevation would have been a recognition, not only of his intellectual powers—quite above the average—but still more of his singular goodness and modesty, and, we suspect also, of his practical abilities and business tact. In 1859, and at twenty-seven years of age, he became a professor in All Hallows' Missionary College, Dublin, and here he taught philosophy until, in 1871, he was appointed to the Bishopric of Raphoe. In his diocese he was occupied in the energetic pursuit of episcopal duties until his death at the close of 1878. There is consequently little of external incident to swell a biography; and the volume is largely made up of extracts from the Bishop's writings and conversations on philosophical, political, literary, and religious topics. His literary criticisms and pieces are good, and his letters to Lord Lifford on Catholic Education best of all. The chapters on his inner life, on his episcopal rule, and on his views as a patriot, are also pleasant reading. The volume is the work of an admiring brother, who makes little effort to be critical. But the record is that of a very pure and noble life, and deserves to be read beyond the circle of those who knew the subject of it.

The publishers' part of the production is excellent; but we have long noticed that the Messrs. Gill's books are conspicuous for their tasteful get up, and for careful printing.

---

*Lectures for Boys.* By the Very Rev. FRANCIS CUTHBERT DOYLE, O.S.B. London: Washbourne. 1879.

THE origin of these little lectures, or sermons, as we prefer to call them (for most of them are sermons), is as follows: As Prefect of Discipline at Douai College, their author was expected to take a large share in the work of moral training of the boys committed to his care; and he soon found that his labour would be in vain, unless he endeavoured to instil Christian principles into their hearts. But *how* to do this was the question. The spiritual books put into their hands were too often dry and abstract; and they did not address themselves to the boy-nature, nor deal with matters incidental to boy-life. The Prefect must himself do the work which he could not find done to hand. So he undertakes, every morning, to deliver to the boys a short "homily or lecture," on the subject of their duties as Christian schoolboys. "The result," he tells us, "fully answered my expectations. Their attention was arrested, their curiosity aroused, and it was gratifying to observe the earnestness with which they strove during the

day to practise the lesson they had been taught in the morning." We have read a fair number of these little discourses, and can readily believe that the writer has not exaggerated their general effect. No words of approval on the part of the critic could add to the satisfaction of such a result; but, as these sermons have not been merely preached but published, there is something else to be said.

For it by no means follows that, "because boy-nature is the same all the world over, what interested or benefited one school will, in all likelihood, interest and benefit many others."\* How, in point of fact, is this larger result to be obtained? If the boys in other schools have these volumes given them to read as spiritual reading, in the times allotted to such reading, no doubt the matter will benefit them, but never as it would had they heard it from the fervent lips of the Douai Prefect. That they will read them—not, indeed, with the zest with which grown-up persons read Newman or Robertson—but for their own sake, at all, is a sanguine expectation. Or will the benefit be obtained by their being preached by other prefects? "I lent you my fiddle, but I did not lend you my fiddlestick," said the preacher, in an old story, to one who complained that the sermon he had borrowed had by no means produced the effect which it had achieved in the mouth of the lender. How, in what sense, can one preacher preach another's sermon? He may *read* it, but rarely indeed is reading an equivalent to preaching. He may commit it to memory; but very excellent must be the sermon which deserves such a labour to be bestowed on it, even if the preacher have time at command. But he may master its argument, or motive—if it have one such argument or motive, as its *raison d'être*; for then he has, not merely the material out of which to make a sermon, but a sermon ready made to hand; and he can retrench, or develop, or illustrate *ad libitum*, so as, in a sense, to make that other one's sermon to be his own. Or if, instead of one chief motive, it have two or three such "points" as they are called—if, that is to say, it be really three little sermons bound in one, so to speak—he may, with a little more mental effort, do the same. But if, on the other hand, it be merely a string of pious thoughts, one suggesting another, with more or less connection, it may do good for the time; it may be useful as suggesting matter for reflection; but it cannot live; it is not a logical whole; nobody will preach it, for nobody *can*. In short, a good sermon must have *matter* and *form*, or it is not, in the strictest sense of the word, a sermon.

Judging the sermons by such a standard (and surely published sermons ought to be judged by the highest standard), we think it no slight praise to say of sermons, one of which was delivered every day, that many of them fully, and many others more or less perfectly, realise our ideal, though others fail to do so, some of which, however, as being *textless*, do not claim to be considered as sermons at all; they are short dissertations, accompanied by suitable practical reflections, and excellent in their kind.

---

\* Preface.

Of the sermons that are faulty, as compositions, we observe that many of them are top-heavy. Each sermon is divided into parts, which are numbered, as I., II., and III. respectively; but these numerals do not designate branches of the subject-matter, as they are always of uniform length, and seem to be mere chronometers. No. I. is often taken up with the introduction, so that a third of the sermon is exhausted before, in parliamentary phrase, there is any question before the House. This is surely a fault. The dominant idea need not, it is true, pervade the matter from head to tail, like the backbone of a fish, but it should make its presence felt, nevertheless, as the theme in a musical composition dominates the opening notes. It is what the preacher has *got to say for himself*, and whatever else is said should be said only for its sake.

Others of the sermons, again, when introduced, have not one but many kindred themes, whereby the effect is always weakened. Still, when all is said, the wonder is not that there are faults, but that, considering the daily demand, the quality of the supply should be so good as it is.

---

*The Anglican Ministry; its Nature and Value in relation to the Catholic Priesthood.* An Essay by ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A., of the Oratory. With a Preface by His Eminence Cardinal NEWMAN. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1879.

THE author of this newest work on Anglican Orders, himself an eminent convert from that party in the Anglican Church called "Ritualists," publishes the book in the conviction that one of the chief obstacles which prevent Ritualists from submitting to the Catholic Church is their persuasion of the reality of the "Orders" of their clerical guides. This learned and elaborate Essay is, therefore, addressed to the "highest" portion of the Anglican Communion. It is, as Cardinal Newman remarks in his Preface, an *argumentum ad hominem*. The Ritualists hold doctrines which are unreasonable and practically blasphemous unless they possess a true Priesthood. That they have no true Priesthood is what Father Hutton has undertaken to demonstrate, from theology, from history, and from existing facts. The novelty of the book, apart from a certain freshness and literary power in putting well-known points, consists in the clearness with which the writer brings out the idea of the Christian *Sacerdotium*, its existence and its prominent position in the Church of Christ, and the complete suppression of its very notion in the Anglican heresy. As Cardinal Newman says:—

If the Catholic view of the *Sacerdotium*, as residing in the Christian ministry, be a truth of revelation; if, nevertheless, it is not, and never has been held by any Anglican minister, since Anglicanism existed, till the last thirty years; if Anglicans, I say, have neither believed in the existence of such a gift, nor professed to use it, nor taught and honoured it; if, rather, they have called it a "blasphemy,"—who shall say, without a great paradox, that suddenly a small minority of the Anglican body is possessed of it, while the main body persists not simply in ignoring it, or in being ignorant of it, but in knowing it too well as claimed by us

Catholics, and denying utterly that such a gift was ever made by our Lord to any one? Sacraments the Church of England has ever claimed, but never Sacrifice (p. x).

In his desire to bring into clearer relief the idea of the "Priesthood" or *Sacerdotium*, the writer has been betrayed into what he has already acknowledged\* to be a looseness of language, which is all the more to be regretted because his case would have been quite as cogent without it. It is not accurate to say that the "reservation," to bishops of certain acts—(Confirmation and *Ordination* being apparently named)—is "a matter of ecclesiastical discipline rather than of divine institution" (p. 187). The distinction between bishops and priests, and therefore between their respective powers and functions, is certainly of divine institution at least as regards the conferring of the Priesthood. Father Hutton only meant that the Episcopate and the Priesthood are one sacrament, one Order, and one in many of their attributes—especially in this, that they have only equal powers as to the consecration of the Blessed Sacrament. His reason for insisting on this is obvious. A Church, which has ostentatiously renounced the "consecration" of the Holy Eucharist and the idea of a sacrifice, lies, first of all, under a *primâ facie* suspicion of having renounced the Priesthood altogether. In the next place, the renunciation of sacrificial truths and terminology goes a long way to vitiate a sacramental form which is already so vague as to be dependent on its surroundings for its true meaning. And, thirdly, if the validity of Anglican Orders depends on the acts of men who did not believe in a sacrificial power conferred by Orders, there is strong presumption those acts were not what they should have been. These views are drawn out at length. There is a cumulative force resulting from this argumentative process which at least effects one result—it throws the *onus probandi* on the Ritualist clergy themselves. No member of a Ritualist flock, who takes the trouble to follow Father Hutton, can now dispense himself from doubting, to say the least, the "Orders" of his pastor.

Doubtless, the historical argument is the only one which can be depended upon for the peremptory disproof of the Orders of the Anglican Church. This proof Father Hutton gives, also, at considerable length and with great impartiality. Catholics (he says) do not pretend to prove that Barlow was never a bishop; what they contend is, that there is nothing to show that he was. That being so, there is no proof that Parker was consecrated, either; and innumerable circumstances which combine to make us doubt. Therefore, before the world, and on every judicial and common-sense principle, Anglican Orders are practically disproved. But we confess that, although Father Hutton gives us a most useful *résumé* of all the historical evidence, not only epitomizing Canon Estcourt's invaluable labours, but giving a clear and tolerably complete account of the literature of the controversy, yet we feel that the book will make its mark by its treatment of the question of the *Sacerdotium*. Cardinal Newman's preface is a masterly enforcement of the words already cited from it—the view that a Sacri-

---

\* In a Letter to the *Tablet*, March 6, 1880.



ficing Priesthood has all along been repudiated by the Anglican Communion. Especially worthy of note, as a distinct addition to the materials of the discussion, is the passage from Waterland, in which that "very learned, careful, temperate" writer, "perhaps the greatest authority on a question of doctrine of all the Anglican divines," most decisively repudiates, on behalf of his Church, the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

---

*The Life of Dom Bartholomew of the Martyrs, Religious of the Order of St. Dominic, Archbishop of Braga.* Translated by Lady HERBERT. London: Richardson and Son. 1880.

THIS biography of an eminent servant of God will be welcomed by all devout Catholic readers. Dom Bartholomew was a bishop of the type of St. Charles Borromeo. It is too much the fashion to assume that apostolic bishops were rare exceptions in the age which immediately preceded the Council of Trent. That there were numbers of rich and free-living prelates forced on the Church by kings and secular lords, is only too true. But the names which we find in the lists of the great Council itself are such as prove beyond a doubt that the good and the faithful were found everywhere side by side with the less worthy. This work supplies us with a detailed life of one of the most prominent of the Fathers of Trent. Dom Bartholomew—who took his singular name, "de los Martyres," from a little church in Lisbon where he was baptised, and the title of which he chose when he received the religious habit—was a Portuguese, a Dominican friar, and finally Archbishop of Braga. His life is the life of a saint. But the present biography is chiefly occupied with tracing his character as a pastor and a warm reformer of pastors. His influence in his own diocese was not greater than that which he exercised over the Fathers of Trent, over the Cardinal of Lorraine, and over Paul IV. himself. It is hardly too much to say that the legislation of the Council on bishops and pastors of souls is owing to him as to its principal author. In his speeches and actions during the Council, and in his own diocesan work both before and after, we see the anticipation of St. Charles. He knew St. Charles. During a short visit to Rome which he paid whilst the Council was sitting, Dom Bartholomew met the saintly Archbishop of Milan, who was then very young. The latter was already given up wholly to the workings of the Holy Spirit; but his heart was strengthened and his insight deepened by the conversation and advice of a man whom all were already reverencing as an Ambrose or an Augustine. Dom Bartholomew placed in the hands of St. Charles the manuscript of his "Stimulus Pastorum," and ever afterwards St. Charles spoke of the Portuguese Archbishop as his teacher and his master.

We are fortunate in having the history of this great prelate in considerable detail. An account of his life was first written, whilst he was yet living, by his fellow religious and intimate friend, Father Louis of Granada, who died, however, before the Archbishop, and so left his history unfinished. Various other writers have supplemented Granada's devoutly-written narrative. The present translation is made from the French life, written, or edited, by the religious of the

general noviciate of the Dominicans in Paris, in 1663. The title page, indeed, says that it is translated from "his biographies written in Portuguese, French, and Spanish;" but we have not found that there is anything more in the book than a translation, somewhat free at times, of the French work here referred to. Indeed, it is difficult to see what else could have been done unless the really original Portuguese life of Louis de Souza had been carefully compared. The French compilers tell us they used the Spanish life by Muñoz; and Muñoz professes to translate de Souza. But Muñoz is one of those "elegant" writers of biography, more common in the seventeenth century than now, who were fond of embellishing their subjects, not only by writing original reflections, but also by inventing original facts. Doubtless, the salient facts in the life of Dom Bartholomew are given fairly enough; but he is credited with a whole series of highly ornate speeches which are evolved partly out of the very slender record of what he actually said, and partly from "Holy Scripture and the Fathers," and the writer's own idea of what he ought to have said. The French compilers avow that they had to cut down Muñoz in numberless places and try to go back to Granada. But they also confess that they themselves have embellished a little: "Et lors qu'il a falu nécessairement y suppléer quelque chose, nous l'avons pris autant qu'il nous a été possible, des paroles mesmes de l'écriture et des Saints Pères, que nous avons trouvées dans les Livres de ce Saint Prélat." Lady Herbert, curiously, omits these words, and only these words, from her rendering of the preface. But they are quite essential for the right understanding of this life. The long speeches put into the holy Prelate's mouth as delivered at the Council, or before the Pope, or to the king, or to St. Charles, are not much more authentic, as speeches, than those of Agricola or Catiline. That is no reason to regret or reject them. They are authentic in the much more important sense of being the true sentiments, and even the very words, written by the holy man on other occasions. A life like this must not be judged as if it were a secular biography. It is written for edifying reading. And the reader of a saint's life is glad of the saint's words and opinions, however they are reproduced. He will find in this volume a really vivid and interesting picture of Dom Bartholomew's own diocese, and of the Council of Trent; and the large and extended extracts from the Fathers and the best spiritual writers are well adapted to give to the clergy a high idea of their holy vocation, and plentiful matter for meditation.

---

*Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority.* Mostly Reprinted from the DUBLIN REVIEW. By W. G. WARD, Ph.D. London: Burns & Oates. 1880.

DR. WARD has followed up the volume of reprinted essays we noticed some time ago ("Essays on Doctrinal and Devotional Subjects") by a second volume, containing some dozen of those Papers which have appeared in a continuous series in the DUBLIN REVIEW during the time that it was in his hands. The book arrives so late that we can do no more than call attention to it at this moment; but we hope to return to it in July at considerable length. It need not be pointed out to any reader who has been acquainted with Dr. Ward's writings for

the last sixteen years that he has undertaken, and in great part accomplished, two most arduous works; the one, to lay down on solid basis of reason the foundations of Christian philosophy, the other, to develop and defend the true view of the extent of the Church's prerogative of unerring definition. The present volume reproduces some of the principal Articles in which he has combated the deadly "Gnosticism" of the *Home and Foreign Review*, and drawn out the true notion of the Church's magisterium alike against Anglican theories and undue domestic limitations. If, as some think, the "minimising" controversy is now a thing of the past, and the decisions of the Holy See are simply accepted by the English-speaking Catholics without discussion or reserve, it ought to be emphatically noted that such a result is largely due to Dr. Ward. It may not seem to be so on the surface, but those who have been in contact with the clergy and the instructed laity are well aware that many of both classes, although at any moment ready to die for the faith, have been in great danger of accepting speculative theological views which would have tended to introduce fatal division and partial paralysis into the Catholic body.

We had desired to reproduce some passages of the most interesting (new) preliminary essay, in which Dr. Ward explains his position, and vindicates the course he took as editor of the DUBLIN REVIEW; but it would be impossible to do it justice without printing the whole of it. We must therefore defer saying more for the present, trusting our readers will in the meantime read the book for themselves.

---

*The Pan-Anglican Synod before S. Augustine's Chair.* London :  
Hardwicke and Bogue.

ARCHBISHOP TAIT, in his opening address to the members of the Lambeth Conference, gravely identified himself with S. Augustine, the Benedictine monk and apostle of this nation. "We are here," he said, "and I am addressing you from *Augustine's Chair*."

Had the good prelate been tutored from his youth in Ritualistic ways he would doubtless have supported his newly-assumed honours with more consistency and dignified grace. As it was, his Calvinistic prejudices got the better of him. Fearful lest such an avowal should in the least commit him to make common cause with the innovating school, he immediately cleared himself of all Tractarian imputations by congratulating his fellow-bishops upon the fact of their standing nearer to pure primitive Christianity than even their very Apostle stood!

Not satisfied with this, he went on to speak of the days of S. Anselm and of S. Thomas à Becket as a time of semi-pagan Christianity. He spoke of the shrine behind him, and sneered at the crowds of pilgrims of all nations who in those days flocked to the wonder-working tomb of Canterbury's glorious martyr. Then, with supercilious contempt for the Church's latest dogmatic definitions, as being merely modern subtleties, and with an irreverent allusion to the devotion of the Sacred Heart, he closed his address in words no Dissenting minister would object to make his own.

Two editors, one a Protestant and the other a Catholic, have published a well-timed pamphlet to show, by extracts from the works of Venerable Bede, the real character of the Christianity which was

preached to the Anglo-Saxons by S. Augustine and by his Catholic successors.

The extracts are given under four heads—viz., History, Papal Supremacy, Dogma, and Discipline.

The Catholic Church is now preaching to the English nation the very self-same doctrines it received from its Apostle. It enjoys unity in Faith and rightful jurisdiction, because, united with the See of S. Peter, it rests upon the rock of authority which our Blessed Lord has placed.

The heart of this nation has never altogether forgotten the gratitude it owes to S. Augustine and his companions. It even now has a sincere love for that great Order to which he belonged, and which he planted in the primitive See. Nay, in spite of three centuries of Protestantism, it has a lurking fondness for the old religion, which it is believed will yet be the national faith of England.

That Archbishop Tait should have even mentioned S. Augustine's chair with a certain feeling of gratitude and honest pride is, indeed, a sign of the times. Catholics will find it easy to forgive him for words which he uttered, no doubt, with perfect sincerity. There is one expression in that address which they hear with joy and with hope. Brief as it is, it speaks of progress in the right direction.

*Hierarchia Catholica Pio IX. Pontifice Romano. Supplementum I. ad opus: Series Episcoporum ecclesiæ Catholicæ 1873 editum. Collegit P. PIUS BONIFACIUS GAMS, O.S.B. Monasterii: typis E. Stahl. 1879.*

**D**URING 1879 Father Gams, of St. Boniface's, Munich, has enriched Catholic literature with two learned works. After a delay of several years he has published the last volume of his great "Ecclesiastical History of Spain," principally remarkable for the thorough treatment of the subject of the Inquisition. Moreover, he has brought out the above-mentioned "Supplementum primum" of the Series containing the Catholic Hierarchy throughout the world under Pius IX. The present Supplement presents a twofold aspect: it both corrects and adds to the main volume. The learned author who well represents in our time the great French Maurists of the 17th and 18th centuries, lays before us the list of Bishops who have been elected, have lived, and have died between June 16, 1846, and April 18, 1879. Next to the ecclesiastical province presided over by the Pope himself, we find the young but flourishing Church of the United States. England is here with her new hierarchy, and Scotland likewise, whilst Ireland is reserved for the next Supplement, to be published within three years. Father Gams, though largely employing Dr. Maziere Brady's valuable book on the Episcopal Succession in England, Ireland, and Scotland, remarks that with regard to Ireland that work will have to be corrected in several places, and added to. Last, but not least important, come the notices of the Oriental Churches united with the Holy See. An excellent index concludes the Supplement. Every public library and student of Church history should be provided with it.

# INDEX.

---

- ALLIES, T. W., *Per Crucem ad Lucem*, *noticed*, 545.  
 Anglade, Dr., on Gallicanism, 225.  
 Antoine's Theology in Maynooth, 242, 244, 247.  
 Ashwell, A. R., The Life of the Rt. Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., *noticed*, 559.
- BALFOUR, A. J., on Philosophical Doubt, 133; A Defence of Philosophical Doubt, *noticed*, 269.  
 Bardenhewer, Dr. Otto, Polychronius Bruder Theodor's von Mopsuestia, &c., *noticed*, 535.  
 Baring-Gould, S., Germany Past and Present, *noticed*, 551.  
 Bartholomew of the Martyrs, Life of. Translated by Lady Herbert, *noticed*, 571.  
 Bede, Venerable, legend of the death of, 181.  
 Berkeley, Mr. Herbert Spencer on, 36, 40.  
 Bible, Holy, Speaker's Commentary on, N.T., Vol. II., *noticed*, 537.  
 Birthday Books, *noticed*, 549.  
 Blount, Edmond le, *Etude sur les Sarcophages Chrétiens Antiques de la Ville d'Arles*, *noticed*, 553.  
 Brain and Nerves, recent research on, 372; and spinal cord, 378; description of, *ib.*  
 Bridget, Father T. E., on a Protestant Life of St. Hugh, 355.  
 Bunbury, E. H., History of Ancient Geography, *noticed*, 527.  
 Bute, John Marquess of, The Roman Breviary Translated, *noticed*, 289.
- CERTITUDE, true principle of, 107; Mr. Mill's theory of, 108; Mr. Herbert Spencer's theory of, 110.  
 Charnes Thomas ex, *Compendium Theologiæ*, *noticed*, 276.  
 Chinese in Mauritius, 14.  
 Clerke, Aubrey St. John, on The Land Question and Law Reform, 134.  
 Cobb, James F., Workman and Soldier; a Tale, *noticed*, 544.  
 Conder, C. Reignier, Judas Maccabæus, *noticed*, 532.  
 Conder, F. R., and C. R., A Handbook to the Bible, *noticed*, 539.  
 Condillac, action of, on Locke's teaching, 79.  
 Conveyancing, Scotch, 146; reform in English, 147.
- VOL. XXXIV.—NO. II. [Third Series.] Q Q

Coolies in Mauritius, 13; system of recruiting for, 23.  
Creole *patois* of Mauritius, 15.

DELAHOGUE, Dr., alleged Gallicanism of, 219, 236.

Dickens, Charles, *The Letters of*, 409; letters interpret the life of, 411; style and value of letters of, 413; constancy of, to friends, 414; a specimen of, at his best, 416; care of, for his servants, 417; as an author, 418; as an editor, 419; as a reader, 420; as a reformer, 422; political opinions of, 425; religious views of, 429; a dream of, 434; escapes dangers of spiritualism, 435, and of free-thinking, 436.

Doyle, Very Rev. F. Cuthbert, *Lectures for Boys*, *noticed*, 567.

Dupanloup, Bishop, on too-early study of philosophy, 445.

EDISON's Electric Lamp, 519.

Eighteenth Century, European thought in, 74; characterized as "le siècle Français," 75; influence of Locke on, 78; influence of Voltaire on, 79; Rousseau's influence on, 83; corrupting effect of French Court on, 86; influence of Cæsarism on religion in, 87; position of clergy in, 90; fruits of Renaissance in, 93; condition of women in, 95.

Elam, Ch., M.D., *Winds of Doctrine*, *noticed*, 566.

Encyclical "*Æterni Patris*," force of, 200; what it does for philosophy, 201; what it does not do, 202; its action on science, 206; its effect on method of theological teaching, 208.

Ethical judgments, analysed, 117 *et seq.*; bearing of, on Theism, 123, 130.

Ethics, in its bearing on Theism, 101; different principles of, 116.

Evans, A. Bowen, *Reflections delivered at Mid-day Celebrations*, *noticed*, 558.

FALK-LAW, laid before Prussian Chamber, 330; against the Constitution, 332; details of, 335; passes into law, 340; opposition of bishops to, 341; and of Catholics, 345.

Farrar, Dr. F. W., *The Life and Work of St. Paul*, *noticed*, 539.

GALLICANISM in Maynooth, reply to allegation of, 210, 212; of Irish Clergy reply to, 213.

Gallwey, Father, S. J., *Lectures on Ritualism*, *noticed*, 561.

Gams, R. P. Bonifacius, O.S.B., *Hierarchia Catholica Pío IX. Pontifice Maximo*, *noticed*, 574.

Gasquet, J. R., on Recent Research on the Nerves and Brain, 372.

Groote, Gerard, and Thomas à Kempis, 392, 395.

HAMILTON, Sir W., Mr. H. Spencer's criticism of, 46.

Heida the Prophetess, *The Legend of*, 172.

Henry, L. E., *The Last Days of Bishop Dupanloup*, *noticed*, 285.

Higgins, Dr., on Gallicanism, 231.

Hill, Walter H., *Historical Sketch of the St. Louis University*, *noticed*, 548.

Hingston, James, *The Australian Abroad*, *noticed*, 524.

Hugh, St., A Protestant Life of, 355; reverence of, for relics, 357; belief of,



- in Real Presence, 359; charge against, of breaking Eucharistic fast, 362; and of breaking an oath, 368.
- Hume, Mr. Herbert Spencer on, 38, 41.
- Hutton, A. Wollaston, *The Anglican Ministry*, *noticed*, 569.
- IDEAS of "wrong," "virtuous," &c., simple notions, 117, 126.
- Idealists, Mr. Herbert Spencer against, 36.
- "Imitation of Christ," authorship of, 382; testimony of MSS., to authorship of, 389; compared with Heusden's writings, 395; Flemish idioms of, 398; peculiar punctuation of, 402.
- Intuitions, authority of, 101; phenomenists admit, 102; thought must rest on, 104; definition of, 107.
- Ireland, The Distress in, 464; extent of, 465; statistics of, 469; causes of, 470; Government measure for relief of, 473; private measures for relief of, 476; not yet over, 479.
- Irish Church Mission Society during the Distress, 478.
- Irish Clergy, alleged Gallicanism of, 213.
- Irish Grievances, history of, 480; recent agitation of, 481.
- Irish Land Question, 482; fixity of tenure and, 483; tenant-right and, *ib.*; agrarian evils and, 484; effects of absenteeism on, 485; peasant proprietorship and, 486; emigration and, 488.
- JADART, Henri, Dom Jean Mabillon, *noticed*, 552.
- Jansenism, Louis XIV.'s treatment of, 87.
- KANT, Mr. Herbert Spencer's criticism of, 42.
- Kempis, Thomas à, the author of "Imitation," 383, 389; Gersen and Gerson rivals of, 383; Mgr. Malon's defence of, 385; life of, 392.
- Kihn, Dr. H., Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten, *noticed*, 533.
- Kleutgen, Fr. J., and the revival of Thomism, 195.
- Kulturkampf, History of Prussian, 327; debates of November, 1872, on, 328; English sympathy with Catholics under, 329; sympathy of Pope Pius IX., *ib.*; Letter of Pius IX. to Emperor on, 347; persecution of clergy under, 349, 353; banishment of clergy, 351.
- LAEMMER, Hugo, Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa, *noticed*, 277; De Martyrologio Romano Parergon historico-criticon, *noticed*, 279.
- Land Question and Law Reform, 134; difficulty of transfer of, 135; registration of deeds and titles of, 139; difficulties to registration of, 141, 143; committee on titles and transfer of, 144, 148; evils of a "legal estate" of, 149; social and political aspects of, 151; meaning of free-trade in, *ib.*; Mr. Kay on free-trade in, 152; problem of entail and settlement of, 155; peasant proprietorship, 157.
- Lanigan, Dr., theory of St. Patrick's birthplace, 291, 295, 316; main defect of, 317.
- Leo XIII., Pope, and Modern Studies on, 190; Encyclical "Æterni Patris" of, *ib.*

- Leo XIII., Pope, letters of, on study of St. Thomas, 254; on Works of St. Alfonso, 256; to Société Scientifique of Brussels, 258; on Christian marriage, 492; on his edition of St. Thomas, 505.
- Liebermann, F., *Ungedruckte Anglo-Normanische Geschichtsquellen*, *noticed*, 280.
- Lilly, W. S., on Eighteenth Century, 74.
- Locke, Voltaire's estimate of, 76; influence of, on European thought, 78; later developments of doctrines of, 79.
- Louis XIV.'s treatment of Protestantism, Jansenism, and the Holy See fraught with evil, 87.
- MACDEVITT, Rev. John, Memoir of Most Rev. James Macdevitt, *noticed*, 567.
- MacHale, Archbishop, on Gallicanism in Maynooth, 233.
- Mathews, Edward D., *Up the Amazon*, *noticed*, 522.
- Mauritius, 1; description of, 6; mountains of, 7; rivers of, 9; history of, *ib.*; emancipation of slaves in, 12; Creoles in, *ib.*; Coolies in, 13, 23; Chinese in, 14; *patois* of, 15; climate of, 19; sugar produce of, 21.
- Maynooth, Gallicanism of, reply to, 210, 215, 220; nature of Gallicanism attributed to, 212; rigourism of, in moral theology, 240.
- Mazella, C., S.J., *De virtutibus Infusis*, *noticed*, 273.
- Merx, A. von, *Die Prophezei des Joel*, *noticed*, 275.
- Metaphysics of the School, Father Harper's volume on, 463.
- Mill's theory of primordial certitude, 108.
- Mivart, Prof. St. George, on Mr. Herbert Spencer's "System of Philosophy," 26.
- Moral Truths, self-evidently necessary, 120; are first intued in individual cases, 121.
- Moran, Bishop, Irish Saints in Great Britain, *noticed*, 283; on birthplace of St. Patrick, 291.
- Morley, John, contrasts Voltaire and Rousseau, 84.
- Murphy, J. Mortimer, *Sporting Adventures in the Far West*, *noticed*, 523.
- NASMITH, David, *The Institutes of English Law*, *noticed*, 546.
- Necessary truths, what? 112; some "ampliative" propositions are, 113; relation of, to necessary Being, 115.
- Nervous System, recent research on, 373.
- Newman, Cardinal, on Conscience, quoted, 128.
- Nordenskiöld's Expedition, 518.
- "ODIN the Man," Legend of, 169.
- "Oswy of Northumbria," Legend of, 174.
- PAN-ANGLICAN Synod before St. Augustine's Chair, *noticed*, 573.
- Panama Canal, 517.
- Parish-priests, nomination of, claimed by Prussian Government, 353.
- Pascal, Voltaire's estimate of, 82.
- Patrick, St., Birthplace of, 291; ancient testimonies as to, 292; reconciliation of ancient names with, 300; with Alclyde, 302; with Memthor, 303;

- Campus Tabernæ, 307; Vicus Bannave, 309; Neutria, 311; Arimuric, 312; Hurnia, 313; Euon, 314; modern theories as to, 316.
- Peasant Proprietorship, 157; in France, 158; in Switzerland, 159; in Greece, 160; its evils, 161; in Ireland, 163.
- "Perception," Mr. H. Spencer's misapprehension of, 34.
- Periodicals, *noticed*, French and Belgian, 267, 514; German, 259, 507; Italian, 263, 511.
- Perry, Canon, Life of St. Hugh, 355; incompetence of, to write it, 369.
- Philosophy, Scholastic, how far the Church's, 191; why now commended by the Pope, 192; revival of, 193; special present need of, 198; how affected by Encyclical "*Æterni Patris*," 200, 461; outline of doctrines of, 204; utility of, 206; text-books of, 439; study of, begun too early, 442; purpose of the study of, 451; study of, a discipline, 453: *see* Text-Books.
- Physiology and Psychology, 380; some conclusions from recent, 381.
- Pike, Nicholas, "*Sub-Tropical Rambles*," 2.
- Pius IX., sympathy for Prussian Catholics, 329, 347.
- Plumptre, Ch., D.D., Movements in Religious Thought, *noticed*, 563.
- Poetry, blank verse and rhyme in English, 182.
- Port-Louis described, 2.
- Potter, Louisa, Lancashire Memories, *noticed*, 287.
- Punctuation in the Middle Ages, 401; peculiar, a proof of authorship of "*Imitation*," 402.
- REALISM, Mr. Herbert Spencer's arguments for, 46, 57.
- Registration of land, 139; difficulties of, 141.
- Rhyme, difficulties of English, 182.
- Rohling, Dr. A., *Das Salomonische Sprachbach*, *noticed*, 274.
- Rood, Ogden N., *Modern Chromatics*, *noticed*, 525.
- Rosmini, *Esposizione della Filosofia di Antonio*, *noticed*, 549.
- Rousseau, estimate of, 83; and Voltaire compared, 84; egotism of writings of, 85; supplies the religion of the *philosophes*, 93.
- SALFELD, Dr. S., *Das Hohelied Salomo's*, *noticed*, 530.
- Sandemann, E. F., *Eight Months in an Ox-waggon*, *noticed*, 528.
- Sanseverino's part in revival of Scholasticism, 194, 197.
- Saxon Saints, Legends of, 165; aim of, 168; criticism on, 181: *see* Vere, Aubrey de.
- Scholastic Philosophy: *see* Philosophy.
- Science, Pope Leo XIII. and Modern, 206; Notices, 517.
- Scott, C. Newton, *Foregleams of Christianity*, *noticed*, 540.
- Sensation, and the nerves, 374; differences of, 376; of extension, 377.
- Shearman, I. F., *Theory of St. Patrick Sen.* refuted, 321.
- Slevin, Dr., on Gallicanism, 228.
- Spedding, James, *Reviews and Discussions*, *noticed*, 284.
- Spencer, Mr. Herbert, "*System*" examined, 26; claims of, on Catholics, 29; fallacy runs through the psychology of, 30; great merits of, 30; analysis of theory of knowledge of, 33; attack of, on Idealists, 36; arguments of,

- for Realism, 46, 51, 57; his "Dynamics of Consciousness" examined, 58; his differentiation of subject and object, 61, 63; his system is "transfigured realism," 65; his theory of "ancestral certitude," 110.
- Spinoza, Voltaire's false estimate of, 82.
- Stone, O. C., A Few Months in New Guinea, *noticed*, 521.
- Strange, Father R., S.J., Life of St. Thomas of Hereford, *noticed*, 543.
- TEXT-BOOKS, philosophical, supply of, 440; Abbé Brin on, 441; P. Cornoldi on, *ib.*; should be in Latin, 447; objections to English, 450; three marks of good, 453; methods of treatment in, 457; the proper length of, 460.
- Thomas, St., of Aquin, why commended *now*, 192; how far commended, 200, 203.
- Thomist philosophy, restoration of, 193.
- Training, Practical Notes on Moral, *noticed*, 550.
- VERE, Aubrey de, Legends of Saxon Saints, 165; compared with legends of St. Patrick, *ib.*; his legend of Oswy, 178; criticism on, 178; on his verse, 182; on his choice of words, 185; as a Catholic poet, 187.
- Vijin, Cornelius, Cetshwayo's Dutchman, *noticed*, 529.
- Voltaire, *the great philosophe*, 79; literary merits of, *ib.*; Carlyle's estimate of, 80; a development of Protestantism, 81; his wrong estimate of Spinoza, 82; and of Pascal, *ib.*
- WALSH, Dr. W. J., Alleged Gallicanism of Maynooth, 210.
- Ward, Dr. W. G., Ethics in its Bearing on Theism, 101; Notice of Balfour's Defence of Philosophic Doubt, 269; Essays on the Church's Doctrinal Authority, *noticed*, 572.
- Woman's condition in France in 18th century, 95.
- Workhouses, objections of Irish to, 470.

END OF VOL. XXXIV.

